Must The Bible Go

WRAY

Class BS 511

Book .W7

Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.



PROFESSOR NEWTON WRAY.

Must the Bible Go?

Some plain words about Higher Criticism

BY

NEWTON WRAY, A. B., D. D.

Professor of Theology, Bible History and Ethics.
Author of Church Finance, a Twentieth Century
Message to the Churches; The Lodge, a Counterfeit;
Holiness and the Greek Tongue.

THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS CO.

CHICAGO - - - - ILLINOIS

B5511
.W7

Copyright, 1916
BY
THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS CO.

#1.00
JUN 29 1916

©CI.A431669
7-01

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	A Portentous Situation. Old and new methods of attack upon Revelation. How the way is prepared for the popular acceptance of the higher critical theories. Critical concessions.....	13
II.	The Perversion of Sunday School Literature to the Service of Higher Criticism. An insidious propaganda. The "development" theory. The critical animus. Supposed proof of post-Mosaic authorship. Difficulties. Archaeology. Dr. Kuyper	25
III.	Hostility to Revelation. Reason for the zeal of critics. False conception of the literature of the Bible. Proof of hostility. Supernatural inspiration denied. New Testament refutation. Hotbeds of the critical propaganda. Example. Forsyth. Christ assailed. Bearing of critical view of O. T. narratives on the New. Torrey on Smith.....	45
IV.	Requisites for the Quest of Truth. Reply to Shailer Mathews. Primary elements. *Sincerity.* Möller. Wiener's charge. Incident in proof....	61
V.	Requisites, Continued—*Objectivism and General Culture.* Subjectivism. Scriptures not allowed to speak for themselves. Application to secular literature. Prof. Mead's refutation. Goethe's Faust. Lowell and Macaulay. Importance of general culture.....	73
VI.	Requisites, Continued—*Higher Criticism Exposed in the Light of Common Sense.* The Bible and a square deal. Bible demands unique treatmert. Fatal lack in the critics. Ignorance of the rudiments of Christ. Clarke's "use" (or abuse) of the Scriptures.....	87

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		*Page*
VII.	REQUISITES, Continued — *More Common Sense.* Lay sense against the critics. Argument from probability. Incredible situations. Wellhausen's venture. History falsified. Priority of priestly legislation. Argument from non-observance of law	99
VIII.	REQUISITES, Continued—*Common Sense Again.* Can there be *honest* forgeries? Implications. Test of this tree. Problems of the hour and an emasculate Bible. New Testament without an explanation. Spiritual decline. Social demoralization. Remedy	117
IX.	ETHICAL PERVERSIONS OF HIGHER CRITICISM. Loss of the ethical sense. Perversion of the conscience. Libérty of thought confounded with indifference to contract. Treason to Christ. The Church's duty. Critical admissions	135
X.	FRUIT OF HIGHER CRITICISM AND THE NEW THEOLOGY. Critical propaganda working death. The Church on the sociological switch. Statistics. Low views and loose conduct. Loss of reverence. A barren ministry. The evil in mission lands	145
XI.	"BACK TO CHRIST." A false watchword. The obligation involved. Pauline theology fully established	157
XII.	DARKENING COUNSEL BY WORDS WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE. Lyman Abbott's editorial on the Virgin Birth. Reply. Defence of New Testament record. Prof. Orr's argument	163
XIII.	A DISPARAGED CHRIST: HIS PERSON. The map of revelation. Necessity of a true Christology. How Christ is disparaged. Effect of such teaching	181
XIV.	A DISPARAGED CHRIST: HIS ATONEMENT. How the denial of His deity affects His death. What fixes the meaning of this fact. Problem of sin. Justice and conscience. Not an example but a Saviour. How His sufferings possess infinite value	189

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter *Page*

XV. A Disparaged Christ: His Power. A serious reflection on the character and work of Christ. Holiness not an arbitrary requirement. The pardon aspect of Christianity not its convincing credential 201

XVI. A Disparaged Christ: His Authority. The decisive point. Jesus on trial. The fallible Christ of higher criticism. The *Kenosis*. The seal of truth. Daniel. Jonah. Anti-Christ the end of such treatment of Christ..... 209

XVII. The Indispensable Christ. How thoughtful sceptics have been disillusioned. Prof. Romane's conversion. Scientists. A voice from the land of rationalism. Other examples..... 239

INTRODUCTION

A half century ago infidels sat in the back room of bar-rooms, cursing the Bible and blaspheming the Christ, over bottles of whiskey and mugs of beer. The coarseness and profanity of their attitude toward all things sacred, largely neutralized the danger of their teaching and influence. They were looked upon by thoughtful people as the enemies of everything that contributed to the uplift and betterment of society.

During the last few decades infidelity has changed its tactics, and undertakes to be conciliatory in its attitude toward the Bible and the Church of Christ. It no longer proposes a frontal attack upon the Word of God, but undertakes to make its home within the Church, and, while posing as friendly to the truth, to undermine the foundations of faith.

The most dangerous enemies to the Church of Christ and that evangelical faith which saves the souls of men, are to be found today in colleges and universities supposed to be Christian institutions, and worse still, not a few unbelievers whose teachings are not so brutal and blasphemous as

that of Voltaire and Tom Paine, but are just as fatal to those who follow them, are found in our pulpits. In view of this condition of things, which has led to the deceiving and hurt of a great number of people, the present volume is most opportune. The author, Rev. Newton Wray, is thoroughly qualified for the task which he has undertaken. The following pages will reveal the fact that he has been a close student of the best critics of the Old and New Testaments, and has been able to enumerate a large number of devout and scholarly men, who after the most diligent research, are rooted and grounded in their faith in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.

Many of the destructive critics write as if they had sources of information, or opportunities for research exclusively their own. They also write as if all scholars were in harmony with their theories of unbelief. In considering the destructive critics, it is well for us to remember that spiritual things are spiritually discerned; that mere human intellect, befogged and blinded, with carnality, cannot discern, understand or interpret the things of God. Professor Wray has great advantage in this particular; he has not only enjoyed the privileges of the schools, and the advantages of years of careful and discriminating research, but he is also a devout and earnest Christian,

enjoying that peculiar influence and illumination of the Holy Spirit which gives help and wisdom in the understanding of inspired truth, which cannot be obtained elsewhere.

We most heartily commend this book to Christians and thoughtful persons everywhere. We feel sure that its careful perusal will stimulate the faith and the better equip all believers to defend themselves successfully against the theories and fallacies of modern destructive criticism.

Rev. H. C. Morrison, D. D.,
President of Asbury College.

SUMMARY OF HIGHER CRITICISM

1. "Disputing the Mosaic origin and authenticity of the Pentateuch.

2. Advancing the Post-exile theory of the Levitical system.

3. Discrediting the Historical narrative and inventing the mythical theory.

4. Questioning the existence of any properly predictive element.

5. Advocating rationalistic views of Old Testament inspiration.

6. Attacking the authenticity and authority of the Fourth Gospel.

7. Denying New Testament unity of doctrine, and favoring *schools*, such as Pauline, Petrine, Johannean.

8. Modifying the previous views of the office and objects of Scripture.

9. Advancing the Kenosis theory of the self emptying of Christ; and hence

10. Impugning His omniscience, infallibility and essential Deity.

11. Doubting if not denying his miraculous incarnation and resurrection.

12. Eliminating all that is distinctly supernatural in prophecy and miracle.

Thus step by step criticism has advanced from the outposts to the very centre of the Christian system, as though satanic malice were behind the whole movement, deliberately planning to wreck all faith of disciples in the Bible as a Divine book, and the final arbiter of truth and duty."—*Dr. A. T. Pierson.*

FOREWORD

Some months ago the author of this volume discussed certain aspects of higher criticism in the periodical of which he was associate editor. Yielding to the request of friends who desired to see the discussion in a form suitable for wider circulation, he has consented to the publication of the original papers with such additional matter as might enhance the value of the publication.

That such a discussion is vital to the Christian faith goes without saying. If our religion is founded upon a fallible Bible, we have nothing more than a human system of ethics. That which gives vitality and power to Christian ethics is the supernatural life which inheres only in a supernatural revelation. "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Our "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." But if the Sacred Record be historically disputable, and the Word of God be not divinely inspired, there is nothing to create and sustain a saving faith. Hence the necessity of heeding the apostolic injunction to "contend earnestly for the

faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."

It may be said, it is enough to preach the Gospel; get people saved and they will not be troubled with modern forms of unbelief. That is true. But people will get saved only by a miraculous religion and this will not survive the critical processes that question the validity of the Record and raise up a generation of higher critics in the Church. I am reminded of an old farmer's statement when told how to protect his fruit trees from rabbits. He said he had always found an excellent way to protect them was to "kill off the rabbits." It would avail nothing to have sound trees and condition a healthy flow of sap, if the rabbits barked them. Higher criticism destroys the bark through which the sap of Christianity flows.

I feel how incomplete and inadequate to the situation is this presentation of the subject; but it is hoped some suggestions have been offered that will convince readers of the importance of the issues at stake and of the need of the Church being awakened to what is going on under the name of scholarship in some of her in-

stitutions and pulpits. I cannot but regret the conspiracy of silence or lack of moral courage on the part of the editors of leading church papers who witness these assaults upon the integrity of the Holy Scriptures without a word of protest.

The author has been gratified by the assurance of brethren in the ministry that his effort has been helpful. One minister wrote: "I have been having glorious success in revival meetings and ascribe much to the help I have obtained from your able defence of the old faith." It is hoped that in this form it will accomplish further good.

THE AUTHOR.

Taylor University, January, 1916.

"There is no reason to believe that the Teutonic rebellion of this century against the Divine truths entrusted to the Semites will ultimately meet with more success than the Celtic insurrection of the preceding age. Both have been sustained by the highest intellectual gifts that human nature has ever displayed; but when the tumult subsides the Divine truths are found to be not less prevalent than before, and simply because they are Divine. Man brings to the study of the oracles more learning and more criticism than of yore; and it is well that it should be so. The documents will yet bear a greater amount both of erudition and examination than they have received, but the Word of God is eternal, and will survive the spheres." —Lord Beaconsfield.

"The supreme danger of the Christian religion comes not from outside, but from within. No attack of a merely unimaginative materialism could so undermine and totter this heavenly edifice as the inclination of those inside to sponge away from its interior walls the ancient testimony of a divine origin."—Harold Begbie.

CHAPTER I.

A PORTENTOUS SITUATION.

There was never a time when the encroachments of unbelief upon the domain of faith called for more serious attention than now. There have been times when unbelief was undisguised, when its attacks were coarse and brutal and those who were "set for the defence and confirmation of the truth" were forearmed by the very method of attack. Under such conditions, the foes of Bible truth could secure no solid advantage. The citadel of faith remained unshaken because its defenders recognized the character of these foes and repulsed them with the weapons of inspiration. The strength of its position lay in the fact that the common mind was uncorrupted by error in the guise of truth and was therefore strong in the consciousness of a supernatural Faith, while the unholy distinction of opposing that Faith belonged to a few open enemies of the Cross.

The situation has completely changed. The evil that threatens the life of the Church is not,

as aforetime, the bold, dastardly denial of Revelation but the subtle teaching that professes to be evangelical, yet, on the ground of harmonizing the Bible with modern thought, reconstructs it upon principles and by methods that take away an infallible guide and leaves us a religion of uncertainty. It is the tentative, homeopathic way in which higher critical suggestions are introduced into Sunday School literature or passed on by the concessions of the pulpit and the religious press, thus gradually weakening the conviction that the Scriptures are reliable and preparing the Church to modify its views regarding them. It is, in short, not the open repudiation of the doctrine that the Scriptures are inspired and constitute a revelation from God, attested by miracle, but the adoption and plausible setting forth by professed evangelicals, of views that logically tend to such a repudiation, which forms the gravest peril to the existence of a vital, powerful faith. It is the silent, steady intrusion of these views into the literature and teaching of the church through which they filter down into the common mind, dimming its vision of the spiritual and eternal, and threatening the extinction of a miracle-working religion

in the church, that calls for vigorous, concerted resistance on the part of those who would have the church maintain its character as a Divine institution resting on a Supernatural Book and invested with superhuman power, instead of lapsing into the state of a mere human organization with Christian form and social functions.

As an instance of how the way is prepared for the acceptance of the higher critical theories concerning the Bible, take the assumption that the world's scholarship advocates these theories. If this were so, it would not be conclusive of their truth. It was Cicero who said that no theory is too absurd for some philosophers to support. The world by wisdom knew not God, and it is no more competent from the intellectual view-point to decide how He would reveal Himself to men. It is possible, therefore, that scholars reasoning from false premises, or partial premises, might reach an erroneous conclusion as to the form of a revelation, and the error would be none the less error, though it would be more potent for evil, because of unanimity of opinion.

But it is not true that the only scholarship deserving the name supports the hypotheses of

higher criticism. There are a few men in great repute as scholars who advocate them; and they are, with scarcely an exception, prejudiced against, if not bitterly hostile to, the claim of the Holy Scripture to be the product of Divine inspiration. There are a great many weak imitators of the few referred to—mere echoes of stronger voices, now filling the Church with their empty and misleading reverberations. Of this sort we may mention the case of the Rev. Dr. Geo. P. Mains, one of the publishing agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church who uses his official position to propagate higher criticism throughout the Church by means of a volume of which he is the author and the Methodist Book Concern, the publishers. In this volume occur the assertions, *"It is clear, say our modern authorities,* that he (Moses) could not have been the author of this book (Deuteronomy). *For reasons equally convincing, it is evident* that the book must be the product of a period or periods far later than that of Moses."

Observe the echo-like character of these assertions (indicated by my italic type) which are calculated to produce the impression that nothing

convincing can be said on the other side of this question. For calm, self-assuring dogmatism, for unblushing self-conceit, this assumption is without a parallel. By claiming everything, the higher critics evidently expect to save something. But the game will not succeed, except with those who are influenced by the shadow of a name and receive assumption as argument. How do Dr. Mains' assertions, which are common with higher critics, sound in the presence of such scholars as the Scotch giant, Prof. James Orr, whose book, *The Problem of the Old Testament,* conclusively refutes the critics; Prof. James Robertson of whose work, *The Religion of Israel,* the German Dillman said that it hits the nail on the head, and which is valuable for its constructive character; Prof. William Henry Green, one of the most learned scholars America ever produced, whose books *The Unity of Genesis,* and *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* meet and answer the critics at every turn; Prof. Willis Beecher whose *Reasonable Biblical Criticism* is an example of its own title as well as an exposure of the unreasonable criticism we deplore. Space will not permit mention of all who have fully disproved the radical critical contention.

Special mention must be made of Wiener, the able, scholarly Jew of London, England, whose published works and articles occasionally appearing in the *Bibliotheca Sacra Quarterly,* make mincemeat of higher criticism, leaving nothing solid or substantial in its arguments. The appearance of this champion of Moses and the Prophets has smitten the critics with confusion. With him agree Troelstra, the Dutch successor of Kuenen at Leyden, Dahse of Germany, and others. The work of these scholars has put a new phase on Old Testament criticism and compelled the admission from certain critics that it has cast a cloud of uncertainty over their hypothesis. Has Dr. Mains ever heard of them?

In the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1914, Dahse, writing on "Is the Documentary Theory Tenable?" refers to three important admissions. He says: "In Germany, in England and America, leading members of the prevailing school have either abandoned important positions held by the higher critics or adopted the methods of the textual critics." It was by these methods that Wiener

and Dahse showed the untenableness of the Documentary Theory.

The first admission cited is by Hugo Gressman. Dahse says: "In Germany Hugo Gressman has published his work 'Mose und seine Zeit.' According to this Moses is the founder of the Israelitish religion; out of the organic development of his work sprung the works of the great prophets; they are heirs of Moses, without whom they could not have accomplished what they did; the Red Sea incident is an historical event which was an occular demonstration to the Israelites of the absolute supremacy of Jahweh over the gods of the Egyptians. The religion of Jahweh, which Moses introduced, is a thoroughly moral religion. Through the services of Moses the sphere of justice was for the first time embodied in the domain of religion on Israelitish soil, thus creating the firm foundation for the future nature of the state. The stories of Genesis emanate, in their original form, from pre-Mosaic times; those of the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, extend in their oldest parts in the time of Moses; indeed they are, perhaps, in part, still older. Concerning the Decalogue, Gressman not only considers a Mosaic con-

ception of it possible, but even asserts that the Decalogue of Exodus XX was the catechism of the Hebrews in Mosaic times." Gressman is also shown to admit the force of the textual argument against the Documentary Theory.

The second admission cited by Dahse is by Dr. S. Skinner, an advanced higher critic, whose long discussion of Dahse's book in the Expositor "shows that nevertheless it has gradually become clear to the representatives of higher criticism that they must, *nolens volens,* right themselves in regard to the materials for textual criticism offered by Mr. H. M. Wiener, myself, and others." Dr. Skinner "finds himself compelled to emphasize the fact that he is 'far from thinking that the last word has been said about the problem of the LXX and its bearing on the history of the Hebrew text. Dahse's work has made it impossible for critics to treat that problem lightly, and has set a high standard of accuracy and thoroughness to those who shall attempt it;' 'that confidence in the results of critical analysis must be seriously shaken;' and 'we must frankly acknowledge that the trustworthiness of the Hebrew text in its

transmission of the divine names calls for more thorough investigation than it has yet received at the hands of critical scholars.' "

The third admission is that of Professor Julius A. Bewer, who, in his article, "The Composition of the Judges, Chaps. 17, 18," published in the American Journal of Semitic Languages (July, 1913), "employs in reference to the book of Judges, the same rules which the textual critics would like to see employed with regard to the Pentateuch. There he states: 'Now it may be set down as a working principle of literary criticism, or, if not as a principle, at least as a reasonable demand, that the theory of a compilation of two parallel versions in a given story should be resorted to only when the other theory fails which tries to overcome the difficulties by means of textual criticism, by the discovery and excision of glosses and interpolations, and by the emendation of corruptions, and when there are clear and convincing evidences of two originally distinct versions.' " The conclusion reached from dealing with this portion of scripture according to the principle stated, is: "Through the severest process of literary criticism these chapters have come,

various critical theories have proved inadequate, and now at the end of the process we may confidently regard them as a unity."

Well does Dahse say, regarding Prof. Bewer's reasoning: "Would not the same investigator arrive at the same conclusions if he investigated the Pentateuch in the same manner, just as independently and without prejudice? At any rate, he has, with this extremely praiseworthy article on 'The Composition of Judges, chaps. 17, 18,' made from within the first breach in the fortress of higher criticism."

The decline of the speculative Old Testament criticism in Europe is apparent to unprejudiced observers. Professor Orr told the author several years ago that a strong reaction against the higher criticism was under way. Eerdmans, a pupil of Kuenen, in the preface to his Die Komposition der Genesis, writes: "I renounce the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen school and altogether oppose the so-called Newer Documentary Hypothesis." And Möller, at one time an adherent of Wellhausen, says: "After my studies which reach back over

more than a decade, I am strongly of the impression that it is more correct to inquire what single passages are not from Moses than to give back to him a broken fragment here and there."

"It is surprising that the modern critics should not realize that the theory they are asserting is absolutely destructive of the whole Jewish religion. . . . The critical hypothesis, as it at present stands, assumes that the Jewish national consciousness was deliberately and successfully falsified, and that what the Jews have always believed to be the beginning of their religious life was really the end of it. I believe that this is both incredible and impossible."—*Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Wace).*

"A revelation of God that contains all kinds of error is an absurdity."—Prof. Bettex, *The Bible, God's Word.*

"The more I investigate Semitic antiquity, the more I am impressed with the utter baselessness of the view of Wellhausen."—(*Fr. Hommel*).

CHAPTER II

THE PERVERSION OF SUNDAY SCHOOL LITERATURE TO THE SERVICE OF HIGHER CRITICISM

I have referred to the subtle manner in which the advocates of higher criticism are seeking to inculcate and spread throughout the church its radical theories, and adduced the assumption that "modern authorities" have established the truth of these theories, thus virtually stigmatizing the contrary or traditional view as a mark of ignorance or of inability to reason correctly in a discussion of this kind. If we questioned the sincerity of the assumption, we should use the language of the day and call it a "bluff;" but we make no such charge and content ourselves with the statement that men who make this claim think the new views should be taught and prepare the way for a hearing by creating the impression that the best scholarship is on that side of the question. We feel that this claim, though made in good faith by some, is unfair to the opposing view and absolutely

groundless, and I mentioned certain names that stand for the high water-mark of scholarship in support of the conservative position. This list could have been extended had it been considered necessary.

I now direct attention to how the Sunday Schools are being doped with the poison of higher criticism. When Prof. George Adam Smith was in this country he said in a minister's meeting: "Well, now, we have learned how to preach from the pulpit according to the new criticism; we must wait for some genius to arise to teach us how to impart it to the children." I do not know of any genius who has arisen to the task, but a number of editors and writers of Sunday School lesson helps have undertaken to supply this deficiency. In some instances the method of doing this is very cautious and guarded, the most plausible statements making the new viewpoint appear entirely reasonable, while the logical end of the teaching does not appear. An article in the Sunday School Journal discussing the *Divine Human Character of the Bible* and *Moses and the Pentateuch* will illustrate this remark. Speaking of the formation of a national literature from popular beliefs

and traditions, the writer says: "To this rule of gradual development the literature of the Hebrew people, preserved for us in the Old Testament, while in a very definite and exalted sense inspired of God, will be found to form no exception."

The theory of "gradual development" is a favorite one with higher critics, but as understood by the founders and leading exponents of the system it does not consist with a just and adequate interpretation of the Scriptures as the inspired and authoritative revelation of God. As Professor Orr says: "The guiding idea of the critical school is no longer revelation, but evolution." Development in the sense of a progressive revelation is true to fact, for God revealed Himself with ever-increasing clearness from Moses to the prophets, until, with His manifestation in the flesh, was poured forth the fulness of grace and truth. But this is very different from the theory that denies to the Scriptures the unique distinction they claim for themselves as a system of revealed truth with a historical setting framed by special supernatural interpositions. The animus of higher criticism is positively anti-supernatural. It reduces the his-

tory of Israel to the level of a development from mythical fancies and crude attempts to solve the mystery of existence and does not hesitate to characterize the Old Testament narrative as misleading and so jumbled as to need entire reconstruction. Witness the following declaration from Prof. Cornill's "Prophets of Israel:" "The Israelitish narrative, as it lies before us in the books of the Old Testament gives a thoroughly one-sided, and, in many respects, incorrect, picture of the profane history, and on the other hand an absolutely false representation of the religious history of the people, and has thus made the discovery of the truth well-nigh impossible." Observe, to reproduce Prof. Willis J. Beecher's comment on this statement, "Dr. Cornill does not say that the Old Testament writers may here and there have inadvertently made a mistake or that there may be elements of fiction or of figure of speech in the Scriptures, which men have mistaken for literal fact. What he says is that the secular history is exceedingly untrustworthy, while the religious history is utterly false."

Such is the position of men who sound the keynote for the whole orchestra of higher criticism;

and I charge that articles like the one under review exert an unwholesome influence in training people to join in the chorus. When the writer says of Moses, "To him must be traced the origin and formulation of many customs and institutions from which *the later national system of worship and ritual developed,*" he encourages belief in the critical reconstruction of the narrative which Prof. Cornill declares is wholly unreliable, a reconstruction which implies, if it does not positively state, that "the national system of worship and ritual" is an invention of later times imposed on the credulity of people who revered the memory of Moses. To say nothing of the inconsistency of such an idea with a true definition of development, it is destructive of confidence in the trustworthiness of the Bible narratives. "These teach Abraham was a monotheist; that he became possessed with the idea that he and his descendants were to be Jehovah's own people, chosen that all mankind might be blessed in them; that Moses gave form to the institutions of the Abrahamic people, including civil laws and the ten commandments and an elaborate ritual; that God trained them afterward for centuries, giving them a succession of prophets to

interpret to them His dealings; that as a part of their training He scattered them among the nations; that the great movement culminated and took a new departure in Jesus. One who substitutes for this an outline which is inconsistent with it at every point should be honest enough not to claim that he accepts the Scriptures as truthful." —(Prof. Willis J. Beecher.)

Dr. John Lord has truly remarked: "It follows necessarily (from a denial that the Mosaic code and the various deliverances of the Israelites were due to the direct agency of Jehovah) that all the miracles by which the divine legation of Moses is supported and credited, have no firm foundation, and a belief in them is superstitious—as indeed it is in all other miracles recorded in the Scriptures, since they rest on testimony no more firmly believed than that believed by Christ and the apostles respecting Moses. Sweep away his authority as an inspiration, and you undermine the whole authority of the Bible; you bring it down to the level of all other books; you make it valuable only as a thesaurus of interesting stories and impressive moral truths, which we accept as we do all other kinds of

knowledge, leaving us free to reject what we cannot understand or appreciate, or even what we dislike."—*Jewish Heroes and Prophets.*

Observe how this Sunday School writer seeks to cloud the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He refers to the fact that Moses is spoken of in the third person. This is not conclusive of another hand in the composition of these writings, since the habit of concealing their identity is common with the sacred historians.

In point of fact Moses often spoke in the first person, as when he remonstrated with the people for their murmuring (Ex. 16:8) and when he rehearsed the law in the plain of Moab. The very book (Deuteronomy) which is with the critics "the firm foundation on which they build their superstructure," is almost wholly in the first person, as naturally it should be. In other books, where God Himself gives the Law and prescribes the ritual, Moses might well refer to himself in the third person. "All through the story," says Prof. W. H. Griffith Thomas, "God comes first with Aaron as the spokesman, Jethro as the adviser, and Joshua as the military leader; the humility of

the record concerning Moses is essentially true to life."

Expressions and statements are mentioned as "clearly belonging to a later period than do the events which they describe." Thus the statement in Gen. 12:6 and 13:7 that "the Canaanite was then in the land," "could be made only in retrospect by an author writing at a time when the Canaanites were no longer in possession." Another explanation is possible. It was doubtless the design of the writer of that passage to show that the Canaanite was *"then* in the land" as well as *now;* that the settlement of Canaan by these nations took place *before Abraham's* migration.

Gen. 36:31 is cited as an instance of a writer speaking of a time long past when he says: "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel." The implication is not necessary. Kings, according to promise were to descend from Abraham and Sarah and Israel, and are, in Deuteronomy, anticipated (Gen. 17:6, 16; 35:11. Deut. 17:14, 15; 28:16). "If the author was a contemporary of Moses he would be interested in the fact that the fulfilling of this part of the

promise had already begun in the Edomite branch of Abraham's family, although it had not yet begun in the Israelite branch; and he would use language accordingly."

The expressions "beyond the Jordan" (Deut. 3:20, 25) and "as Israel did unto the land of his possession which Jehovah gave unto them," (Deut. 2:12) are also taken to mean that the writer's time and place were in Palestine, after its occupation by the Israelites. This position can be maintained only upon the ground that these chapters which form part of the discourse of Moses to Israel were rank forgeries. The first is the language of one *east* of the river who beseeches the Lord to permit him to cross over to the land "beyond Jordan," i. e., to the west of it, and therefore reveals the folly of the critic rather than the inaccuracy of the record. Moses begins his personal address at the 6th verse of chapter 1 of Deuteronomy. Verses 1-5 are introductory and may have been added by Moses himself before he delivered the completed work to the custody of the Levites, as stated in Chap. 31:24-26. Possibly he rehearsed the matter orally and afterwards committed the whole to writing with this brief intro-

duction in the third person—a thing not unknown in our own day where a writer modestly prepares the way for a quotation from himself. In that case, the phrase "on this side Jordan" (Rev. Ver. —"beyond Jordan" verse 5), would accord with the purpose of the book as a document of religious instruction and reminiscence for the people after their settlement in the land. To those who insist upon a later hand for such statements we commend Prof. Beecher's remark below.

With respect to the other passage, it was perfectly correct for Moses to compare the conquest which the children of Esau had made of the land they then dwelt in with the conquest which Israel had completed before this statement was made. See Deut. 3:8-18: "the Lord your God hath given you this land to possess it." And this was part of the covenant territory (Gen. 15:18).

This Sunday School writer is no more fortunate in his claim that the documentary hypothesis of the critics "clears up many incidental difficulties, such as the interchange of names in referring to the same places or persons;" e. g., Horeb and Sinai, where the Commandments were given; Jethro and Reuel, two names for Moses' father-in-

law; Jehovah and Elohim (translated, Lord and God), to designate the Divine Being. This is a sample of the puerility of the critics who cannot imagine a reason why the same writer should use such names interchangeably. Perhaps they might think of a Westerner speaking of Mt. Tacoma at one time and Mt. Rainier (the same mountain) at another time. "Parallel and variant accounts of the same event," continues this writer, "such as occur in the Creation, Flood, and Joseph narratives are likewise accounted for by this interpretation of the Bible record." That there are such accounts is an assumption and not an incontrovertible fact. The reasoning by which it is sought to establish the documentary hypothesis is saturated with subjectivism, superficial, and conclusive only to those who take their cue from the enemies of Revelation. The incapability of such men treating the Scriptures fairly will be noticed later.

Other examples of isolated sentences might have been adduced by the writer in question, but they need not be referred to a later person than some contemporary of Moses, and they certainly do not warrant the radical and in some respects absurd hypothesis of higher criticism. The premise is too

slight to support so huge a conclusion. In the last chapter of Deuteronomy it is said, "There hath not arisen a prophet since Israel like unto Moses." No long interval of time may have occurred before the addition of this statement which was of the nature of an appendix to the writing of Moses. Says Prof. Beecher: "Forty years after the death of Abraham Lincoln people were already saying that we have not since had an American statesman like him. Less than forty years after the death of Henry Ward Beecher and John B. Gough men were saying that there have arisen since no English-speaking orators like them." Such instances, Prof. Beecher thinks, may be referred to the life time of Phinehas, grandnephew of Moses, who was associated with him in public affairs. "Men of the age of Phinehas may well have been the literary executors of Moses."

That there are difficulties in the Scriptures as they have come down to us none deny. But the right attitude is not that of one who seeks to account for them by a reasoning that substitutes difficulty for absurdity and loads the Scriptures down with the suspicion of dishonesty, but that of him who waits for light, meantime believing in

the trustworthiness of the record and doubting not, if light should come, the difficulty would vanish. Whenever light has come, it has always confirmed the *old,* never the *new* view. It is undeniable that every archæological discovery has vindicated the sacred writings, as traditionally received, and compelled the critics to revise their propositions.

"Wherever archæology has been able to test the negative conclusions of criticism," says Prof. A. H. Sayce, in his *Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies,* "they have dissolved like a bubble into the air." This able scholar cites the original critical contention that the fourteenth chapter of Genesis was unhistorical. Some years later the critics were silent about this contention. "In the interval the excavator and archæologist have been hard at work regardless of the most certainly ascertained results of criticism, and the ancient world of Western Asia has risen again from the grave of centuries. A history which had seemed lost forever has been recovered for us, and we can now handle and read the very letters which passed between the contemporaries of Abraham." And that history confirms the accuracy of the writer of

that chapter of Genesis, "even the proper names having been handed down in the scriptural narrative with but little alteration." The name Amraphel was none other than that of the king who codified the Babylonian law, being identical with *Khammu*—or *Ammu-rapi ilu,* the Babylonian for *Khammu-rapi* the god. *Ilu* is the same as the Hebrew *el* for God. This king, "like others of his dynasty, claimed divine honors and was addressed by his subjects as a god."

Among other instances of the triumph of archæology, Sayce mentions the two which were once fundamental to the critical theory. "That Babylonian law should have been already codified in the age of Abraham deprives the critical theory which makes the Mosaic law posterior to the Prophets of one of its two main supports. The theory was based on two denials—that writing was used for literary purposes in the time of Moses, and that a legal code was possible before the period of the Jewish kings. The discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets disproved the first assumption; the discovery of the code of Khammurapi has disproved the second. Centuries before Moses, law had been already codified, and the

Semitic populations had long been familiar with the conception of a code.... Not only could the Hebrew leader have compiled a code of laws, we now see that it would have been incredible had he not done so."

Sir William Robertson Nicoll, reviewing a book written on the critical side, makes the striking remark: "The significant fact is that the great first-hand archæologists, as a rule, do not trust the higher criticism. This means a great deal more than can be put on paper to account for their doubt. It means that they are living in an atmosphere where arguments that flourish outside do not thrive."

When, therefore, we are asked to exchange the traditional for the higher critical view and are expected to sanction the inculcation of its principles in the minds of the young, we reply in the noble language of Dr. Kuyper, the great Dutch scholar and theologian:

"If, then, after all legitimate examination and explanation there still remain (in the text) seeming inexplicables, *cruces interpretum,* before which not I—for that implies nothing—but all confessing theologians stand, even then I do not

hesitate a moment to say it in the hearing of the whole scientific world, that facing the choice between leaving this question unanswered, and with the simple-minded people of God confessing my ignorance, or with the learned ethical brethren from scientific logicalness rejecting the infallibility of Scripture, I firmly choose the first, and with my whole soul shrink back from the last.

"For to say with Rothe and his followers that there are myths of Scripture; the creation narrative a pious phantasy; phantasy likewise the narrative of the fall; the prophecies are products of a higher-tensioned spiritual life; the testimonies borne by Christ and his apostles concerning the old covenant are devoid of normative power; that the apostolic representations of the truth are equally little normative; even the image of Christ which they outline and paint is not fixed reliably; and then solemnly to declare that the whole Scripture, from Gen. 1:1 to Rv. 22:21, is the Word of God, is more than I can do; it is too bold for me; it looks wonderfully much like a *protestatio actui contraria,* which I hear of but of which I have no understanding. And when, moreover, I observe that in the circles of these 'faithful' ones the mod-

ernizing vivisectors are widely known, and that, on the other hand, the orthodox champions of inspiration—such as Gaussen not only, but also such men as Hodge and Philippi; yea, even Beck and Mehring—are scarcely known at all, then, in all seriousness, I am filled with apprehension for the future. Then I seem to hear the rushing waters; and I feel the 'zeal of God' come over me which compels me to reject a 'Word of God,' so-called, which is fallible, as a *contradictio in terminis,* which exchanges fixedness of principle for half measures, and which, while ever going backward toward Christ, constantly separates itself but further from the 'Christ according to the Scripture.'

"And should anyone still answer that, judging as I do, I, myself, am not justified, since I acknowledge errors, if not in the autographs, at least in the texts at our service; then let me remove this latent objection by this other question; whether, if you held in your hand a cup of pure gold, but whose edge is slightly damaged, and I held in my hand an entirely perfect cup of gold which is not real, you would say, 'It is all the same to me; I will cheer-

fully take your imitation for my gold cup'?"—*Bibliotheca Sacra.*

Let him who will take the imitation and get what satisfaction he can out of it; we shall not relinquish the genuine cup, even though its edge seems to be slightly damaged, and we object to the substitution being made for those who are not prepared to speak for themselves. I charge that so-called Evangelicals who have become obsessed with the subjectivism of the Graff-Wellhausen school of criticism would get people to exchange their golden treasure of sacred truth for the counterfeit product of this school, and I do not intend to remain silent while this attempt is being made.

"The critics object to the Biblical theory that relies so much on the supernatural; the characteristic feature of their own is the unnatural. The Biblical theory says there was a course of history quite unprecedented, or certainly most extraordinary; the modern theory says that the history was nothing remarkable, but there was quite an unprecedented mode of imagining and writing it. There have to be postulated miracles of a literary and psychological kind, which contradict sound reason and experience as much as any of the physical miracles of the Old Testament transcend them."—Prof. James Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel.*

"The *proton pseudos* (first lie), historically considered, of Graf, Kuenen, and all their followers, consists in this: that they make use of the variety of material afforded them for positively constructing a history of ancient Israel, only to destroy the possibility of such a history. This they appear to do, not so much because of the discrepancies which exist in the materials, as because of their predetermination to reject as untrustworthy all the materials which partake largely of the Hebrew belief in the supernatural."—Ladd.

CHAPTER III

HOSTILITY TO REVELATION.

The subjective explanation for the modern critical views is hostility to supernaturalism. There is an irrepressible prejudice against the very conception of a revelation with miraculous attestations. To quote Professor Sayce: "The presence of a miracle is of itself accounted a sufficient reason for suspecting the truth of a story, or at all events the credibility of its witnesses. If there was no record of miracles in the Old and New Testaments, it may be questioned whether so much zeal would have been displayed in endeavoring to throw doubt on the authenticity of their contents. We find no such display of critical energy in the case of the Mohammedan Koran."

The fundamental conception of the critics (by whom I mean not those who claim to be evangelical, but the originators of the school to which the former have become such blind devotees) is that the literature of the Bible, like any other literature, is only a natural development with no higher in-

spiration than human genius and no supernatural attestation. Of course, coming to the Bible with this bias, they could not treat the Bible fairly. It has not been allowed to speak for itself. The prejudice of the critic has been read into it, in the work of re-construction. Its most distinctive element—the supernatural—was eliminated to begin with, or relegated to the region of myth and allegory. How was it possible under these circumstances to deal justly with the narratives? Prophecy as well as history has suffered mutilation by this subjective, irrational method. Since true prediction is a miracle, it is denied, in the unique sense the Scriptures claim for it, and resolved into a flight of genius. Hence the novel theory held concerning some of the prophetical books. They must be assigned to a later date and thus accounted for by the principle, *Vaticinia post eventum.*

A few quotations from leading critics will show that the charge of hostility to a Divine Revelation is true. According to Delitzsch, the two foregone conclusions of the higher criticism are "There is no true prophecy" and "There is no true miracle." Eichhorn, originator of the expression *Higher*

Criticism, declared: "Miracles do not happen, They have never happened. We cannot accept any book as even historically true which contains narratives of alleged miraculous events." Dr. Milton S. Terry echoes the infidel strain: "Critical studies have dispelled the notion, once quite prevalent, that the prophecies of the Old Testament and the New Testament Apocalypse are history written beforehand." Renan declared, "The exclusion of the supernatural is the first postulate of higher criticism." Kuenen claimed, "We have nothing to do with inspiration." What Knobel and Nöldeke say of Isaiah's prediction of Israel's deliverance from captivity contains the critical reason for re-dating the prophetical writings and claiming for them another authorship. "A prophecy," they assert, "in which Cyrus is called by his name is not naturally the work of Isaiah who could not know in advance either the exile of the people to Babylon or the deliverance from that exile by Cyrus."

Thus the supernatural inspiration by which the prophets foretold far distant future events is arbitrarily set aside as a peculiarity of the Bible, and their foresight becomes simply the knowledge of contemporary events. Dr. Driver holds that "no

intelligible purpose would be subserved by Isaiah's announcing to the generation of Hezekiah an occurrence lying nearly 200 years in the future and having no bearing on contemporary interests." Here we have a bald assumption (it is nothing more) that the prophet always speaks with reference to contemporary interests and that prophecies concerning future events would have been unintelligible to his contemporaries. Not much in advance of this assumption is Prof. George Adam Smith's idea of inspiration: "Isaiah prophesied and predicted all he did from loyalty to two simple truths, which he tells us he received from God Himself; that sin must be punished and that the people of God must be saved. This simple faith, *acting along with a wonderful knowledge of human affairs, constituted inspiration for Isaiah.*" That is to say, Isaiah was inspired in no other sense than Shakespeare or any other genius was inspired. Contrast with this the apostle's definition of inspiration and see how much respect these critics have for New Testament authority. "Knowing this first that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation (Greek—*Comes to be of* the prophet's *own motion* or *inven-*

tion). For the prophecy came not in old time (Gr. *at any time*) by the will of man"—by his "faith, knowledge of human nature and ceaseless vigilance of affairs" according to Prof. Smith—"but holy men of God spake as they were moved (Gr. *borne along*) by the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. 1:20-21.) Here is a Power out of and above themselves that seizes them and carries them along in the stream of its will. Thus prophecy is not the product of their own thought and knowledge, but a direct revelation to their minds. Indeed, they did not always understand the meaning of their own predictions, but "searched what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand, etc." (1 Peter 1:11.) The same apostle declares "unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves" —as Driver contends, having to do with contemporary interests—"but unto us they did minister the things" of their prophecies, that is, not unto themselves or contemporaries but unto future generations did their prophecies pertain.

How superior to the view of Smith and Driver is that of Professor Orr, who says:

"The genuine prophet is conscious of being laid hold of by the Spirit of God as other men are not; of receiving a message from Jehovah which he knows is not the product of his own thoughts, but recognizes as God's word coming to him, which is imparted to him with perfect clearness and overpowering certainty; and which brings with it the call and constraint to deliver it to those for whom it is meant."—*The Problem of the Old Testament.*

Now all these critical contentions regarding Divine inspiration and revelation are identical with the denials of Thomas Paine whose arguments are the stock in trade of certain professors and writers occupying positions of honor and influence in the church. And the portentous feature of the present situation is not that pronounced enemies of a supernatural revelation like Paine and the whole school of German and English rationalism hold and teach such views, but that theological seminaries and editorial sanctums of evangelical churches are hotbeds for the propagation of theories sprung from the soil of rank unbelief. The anomaly is that of professed believers in the inspired, authoritative character of the Scriptures adopting and teaching theories which

destroy that character and wreck the faith of churches, whose activities are reduced to the plane of pure naturalism.

That this is no random assertion may be seen from the tendency to reduce the miracles of the New Testament to mere natural phenomena or to attribute them to the disposition to magnify the marvelous—in other words, to deny the integrity of the record and say the thing never happened. For want of space I must confine myself to a single quotation from the Graded Series of Sunday School Lessons issued by Charles Scribner's Sons, and said to "embody the results of the latest scholarship."

"It is easy to see," runs this "latest scholarship," "that the age that produced the Gospels would not be anxious for scientific accounts of the deeds of Jesus, but that it would expect of Him exactly the acts that are attributed to Him. It is possible, therefore, that some events, like the restoration of the Centurion's servant, were simple coincidences; that others, like the apparent walking of Jesus on the water, were natural deeds

which the darkness and confusion caused to be misunderstood; that others, like the turning of water into wine, were really parables that became in course of time changed into miracles. As nearly all the miracles not of healing had their prototypes in the Old Testament many of them at least were attributed to Jesus because men expected such deeds from their Messiah, and finally became convinced that he must have performed them." Of the same tenor is the expression of doubt whether Jairus' daughter "was really dead, or only in a swoon, or state of coma."

To borrow a phrase, "it is easy to see" what kind of Gospel we would have received had the scientific methods of the "latest scholarship" been employed to produce it. Instead of the simple, faithful narratives that give us an account of a Divine Saviour, who made the living God real to the consciousness of men, we should have had a falsified history with no evidence that God had come down to men in the revelation of His power and grace.

Dr. Forsyth writing on "The Preacher and His Charter," in his work *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* says: "The Gospels are homiletical

biography, not psychological; they are compiled on evangelical rather than critical principles. The stories told are but a trifling selection, not chosen to cast light on the motives of a deep and complex character, but selected entirely from a single point of view—that of the crucified, risen, exalted preached Saviour." He quotes herewith Julicher as saying: "The first Church troubled about the real Jesus only in so far as suited the Jesus living for their faith. . . . Had Mark attempted or achieved such a model biography of Jesus as historical science demands, his work would have been useless for religion."

That the age which produced the Gospels was not anxious for scientific accounts was the surest safeguard from error, because it assured to us a record of events by unsophisticated eye witnesses who were honest enough to tell what they saw without attempting to explain it away. That such an age expected of Jesus exactly the deeds attributed to Him, shows they had a truer notion of the Old Testament than the modern critics have. It was their proof of his Messianic claims—a proof that the critics would have utterly destroyed

by their rationalizing methods, leaving the world in darkness and sin.

There is no half-way house where the mind can rest in this conflict between the traditional and the higher critical view of the Bible. The New Testament must share the fate of the Old, and *Christ goes down with the Prophets.* If there is no supernatural inspiration in the Old Testament, there can be no authority in the New. They stand or fall together. And this is the only consistent, logical view to take. Certainly it is not so reprehensible as the attitude of professed faith in the divine inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, while the heart is with the critics who deny these things. To pretend to believe in the authority of Christ, while holding that the modern scholar is more competent than he to decide who wrote the Scriptures is like the treachery of Joab who said to Amasa, "Art thou in health, my brother?" and then smote him with his sword in the fifth rib. How can they say, "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that thou art Christ the Son of the living God," and then declare he was mistaken when he taught there was a flood in the days of

Noah and that the state of the world at his coming again would be as it was then? Dr. Mains quotes approvingly Dr. Driver's statement: "We are forced, consequently, to the conclusion that the flood as described by the biblical writers is unhistorical."

Thus these blind followers of the blind seek to enlighten the church without the Lamp of Life, for they have rejected His authority. To account for Christ's "false teachings" (?) by the theory that He and the Apostles "held the current Jewish notions respecting the Old Testament," contradicts the facts. He was in advance of His age and repeatedly opposed these notions, boldly charging His contemporaries with ignorance of the Scriptures. "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." His originality and independence of men prove the absurdity of this theory, and establish also the contemporary view of the Old Testament. The men of that age were far better judges of their sacred writings than these belated critics, who care no more for the integrity of the New Testament than they do for that of the Old. Dr. Howard Osgood well said:

"If any one will collect all the myths said to be

in the Old Testament, and compare what is said of these passages in the New Testament, he will soon find that to believe them myths he must make the whole New Testament a far worse myth, for it stamps these so-called myths as truth and builds its superstructure on them. If, as we are told, Christ and the New Testament did not know the truth as to facts in human history on earth, then they were still more ignorant of all things in the future, and no sane man would believe them. To this entire rejection of Christ as to His character and His teachings does the belief in myths in the Old Testament or in the New surely lead."

To which may be added the significant remark of Sir J. W. Dawson, in an able article on the Deluge: "Christianity founds itself, its founder himself being witness, on the early chapters of Genesis, as history and prophecy, and the treatment which these ancient and inspired records have met with in modern times at the hands of destructive criticism is doing its worst in aid of the anti-Christian tendencies of our times."

And nothing in the entire realm of thinking can equal the moral blindness, the ethical misconception and perversity of a profession of faith in the

authoritative character of Christ and the New Testament while questioning their competency to speak the truth concerning the Old Testament. We endorse the characterization of Dr. Torrey who replied as follows to a personal question:

"Brethren, I do not like to answer personal questions, but since this has been asked, let me say right here that I met Prof. George Adam Smith personally, and had a personal talk with him on this very question. Prof. Smith was in Northfield, and, by invitation, I met him at Mr. Moody's house.

" 'Prof. Smith,' I said, 'you teach that the 110th Psalm is not Messianic, and that it was not written by David; that it refers to a brother of Jonathan Maccabeus, and is not by David at all, but by some unknown man of that period. If that be true, one of two things must also be true—it is certain, either that Jesus Christ knew it was not by David, and did not refer to Himself, in which case, in building an argument for His Divinity upon it, He deliberately pulled the wool over the eyes of those to whom He spoke, or else He did not know it, in which case He built an argument for His Divinity upon a mistake. In either case,

what are you going to do with the Divinity of Christ?'

"'I do not build my faith in His Divinity on the 110th Psalm,' he replied.

"'Neither do I,' I said, 'but, having found out that He is Divine, I must maintain that He knows what He is talking about when He built an argument for His Divinity on this 110th Psalm.'

"Professor Smith undermined faith in the historicity of the story of Abraham and other Old Testament stories, and yet, gentlemen, he went into the pulpit on the Sunday morning before the conversation I referred to at Northfield Church, and preached on Gideon without breathing a suspicion that it was not history. You, gentlemen, may call that 'Reverent Higher Criticism;' I call it dishonesty. I do not care whether it is George Adam Smith, or who it is—it is dishonesty."

Yet this is the man who is invited to lecture in denominational schools and whose books are circulated by the denominational publishing houses of this country!

I will now state why a good man of ordinary intelligence is competent to decide the main points

at issue in this discussion and shall give some of the results already apparent of the work of higher critics.

"Even Nature hides her treasures from the trifler."

"We all know the sort of morbidly active-brained child who will pull a valuable watch to pieces, and then tell us with a smile that there was nothing in it but wheels and things. He has his counterpart in the foreign infidel type of scholar, who, albeit as ignorant of man and his needs as a monk, and as ignorant of God and His ways as a monkey, sets himself with a light heart to tear the Bible to pieces. If the Bible must be given up, it is a disaster unparalleled in the history of Christendom."—Sir Robert Anderson.

"The Bible, while it encourages all manner of investigation, insists upon a right method and spirit in the conduct of investigation. He who does not conduct his Bible study in such spirit, forfeits all blessing in that study, and, as has been intimated, may incur the judgment of God in the infliction of judicial blindness; and the ultimate effect of judicial blindness in the teacher is widespread disaster to those who follow his pernicious ways, as has been already seen in many cases in the Church of Christ."—Arthur T. Pierson, *The Bible and Spiritual Criticism.*

CHAPTER IV

REQUISITES FOR THE QUEST OF TRUTH—SINCERITY

A consideration of the qualifications needed for the quest of truth will deal a blow to the dogmatic claims of higher criticism and bring out the inadequacy of mere book learning to determine the main issues of this question. It is the boast of certain critics that their school of thought alone is competent to arrive at a rational solution of the Biblical problem. As an instance of this style of assertion, note the following statements of Prof. Shailer Mathews, taken from an article on *American Protestantism* in the *Constructive Quarterly*. Having attributed the "gratifying progress" of the higher critical and evolutionary views to "the entrance into church life of young men and women who have been trained in the modern scientific point of view, and the historico-critical treatment of the Bible," he says:

"True, the task of theological reconstruction is but begun. The majority of Protestants in America are still Hebraic in their world-view and mon-

archists in their theology. The best theological schools are undoubtedly in advance of the large element of our church membership which is untrained to think in other than inherited words and concepts. It will take at least another ten years to bring our business men to see that they know less about theology than do properly trained ministers."

It would not be difficult to show the error in these statements—their misconception of the teaching of Scripture, their false boast of the superiority of radical scholarship. The Hebraic viewpoint, not the Pharisaical perversion, but the outlook of prophets and apostles, will persist despite critical animadversion, and theological monarchism will continue to be the persuasion of all who pray "Thy Kingdom come," and "wait for His Son from Heaven."

I call special attention to the last sentence, because of its unfavorable comparison of "our business men," with "properly trained ministers." If those men were to study twenty years and be as poorly qualified to reason on this question as most of the modern critics, the church would be doubly afflicted. Some of them know more of real Biblical

theology than half of their critics whose "scientific" training has unfitted them to deal sensibly with the word of God.

This brings me to the point suggested by the topic now to be considered—*indispensable elements in the quest for truth.* The quotation just given implies that technical learning is the one essential to a correct understanding of the Biblical problem. We do not doubt its importance and its place in this discussion; but we insist that the primary place belongs to elements without which such learning is worthless and worse than worthless. For this, unbalanced by certain intellectual and moral qualities, may prove a snare to the investigator, leading to misrepresentation of facts and false generalizations.

The first of these requisites is *sincerity.* I do not shrink from this test for the conservative position. I believe in comparing views that error may be detected and truth established. But I think there is reason to doubt the sincerity of the principal exponents of higher criticism. Examples are not wanting of aversion to an examination of conservative arguments, and, worse still, of refusing to modify views that are shown to be

erroneous. Wilhelm Möller whose *Historical and Critical Considerations against the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis* have been translated and published in English under the title "Are the Critics Right?" says that at one time he was "immovably convinced of the irrefutable correctness of that hypothesis so long as he allowed it alone to have an effect upon him," and "that little encouragement is given to students of the Old Testament even to take in their hand for once a book of a different school. I myself," he goes on, "have been in several cases advised against it by professors. Now it cannot for a moment be doubted that it is utterly unscientific to seek to know one's opponent from polemical writings only."

His deliverance from the Graf-Wellhausen snare is told as follows: "But after my attention was once directed to its weaknesses (first by Kohler in Erlangen) after I had studied with some thoroughness the scientific literature on the other side, this hypothesis seemed to me more and more monstrous. By discussions on the subject in the Theological Societies at Erlangen and Halle, in the Tholuck Institute at Halle, and in the Theological Seminary at Wittenberg, as well

as by frequent conversations with friends and acquaintances, my own view was confirmed and elucidated, so that I hope that the change which took place in my case may and will be effected in others also."

The result of Mr. Möller's studies has been the production of a work ("Are the Critics Right?") which utterly refutes the hypothesis he once thoroughly believed.

This able scholar closes his work with the following conclusions against the higher critical mode of treating the philosophy of religion:

"1. It is in opposition to the Old Testament, which everywhere proclaims a Divine revelation. It is thoroughly unhistorical, in so far as it uses the sources otherwise than they admit of, and yet turns them to advantage so far as they agree with it.

"2. It is at present carried out quite inconsistently in the Old Testament; for the different religious conceptions of the particular laws, even according to criticism, correspond in their origin not to the spirit of the people, but always to the ideal of the individuals only. The people as a whole are still almost as immature as before.

"3. It must, to be consistent, seek to understand the revelation in Christ as a natural development also.

"4. It must regard a perfecting of religious ideas beyond Christ as not only possible, but necessary.

"Moreover, it is not the case, even according to the Biblical view, that the complete revelation was made at the beginning. It is, rather, prepared for by the early revelation and by the leading of the patriarchs. Notwithstanding the revelation, a progress in revelation takes place within the Old Testament (see especially the ethical deepening through the prophets and their Messianic prophecies). Finally, the New Testament is self-evidently a vast advance upon the Old.

"But if we believe that the essential elements of the Old Testament revelation were actually in existence at the time of Moses, we see above all in the further course of Israelitish history a development in understanding of the revelation and in agreement with it."

More recently he has published a book with the German title *Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung. Anleitung zu einer neuen Erfassung des*

Pentateuch—Problems. Of its "most excellent discussion of the use of doublets as a means of establishing the documentary theory," Mr. Wiener remarks: "What an admirable thing it would be if anybody could induce some of our poor higher critical theorists really to master and grapple with this part of Möller's work!"

Now this case of Möller's is adduced to show the insincerity of critics whose obsession with their preconceived theory and the arguments by which they deem it established makes them indisposed to consider opposing arguments and incapable of arriving at sound conclusions. What confidence can be placed in the intellectual and moral leadership of men who advise against taking in hand a book of a different school?

Moreover, as Mr. Wiener, already referred to, one of the ablest scholars that ever appeared in defence of the conservative position, has proved to the hilt, such men have evinced a disregard for the elementary principles of fair dealing with the public, misrepresenting facts and persisting in the publication of views that have been shown to be untenable, thus deceiving the public by concealing the strength of the conservative position and the

weakness of their own. A striking instance of this indifference to the moral requirements of critical investigations is made known in a correspondence between Mr. Wiener and Drs. Driver and Briggs, editors of the International Critical Commentary. This correspondence, relating to Dr. Skinner's Commentary on *Genesis,* and originally published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra Quarterly,* may now be seen in Mr. Wiener's latest book—*Pentateuchal Studies,* published by the *Bibliotheca Sacra Co.,* Oberlin, Ohio. Mr. Wiener lays stress on the following points: "(1) For a century and a half the critics followed Astruc's clue practically without textual investigation; (2) When recent textual researches had rendered their position insecure, Dr. Skinner deliberately misrepresented the facts in an attempt to bolster up the documentary theory; (3) When the attention of the general editors was drawn to this, they took no steps to undeceive the public, which had been deceived under the cover and sanction of their names, and put forward the contentions contained in the joint letters." In a subsequent correspondence with Dr. Gordon of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, who undertook to defend Dr. Skinner, Mr.

Wiener justifies his course in the following indictment against the Wellhausen critics:

"I find that the Wellhausen theories are supported by a large number of professors in various parts of the world, who have enormous power by virtue of their positions, the numbers of their supporters and the extent to which they and their supporters control the general and technical press. The power is used with the utmost unscrupulousness to prevent any opponent of theirs from getting a fair hearing and to induce their pupils and the general public to believe that their theories are unchallengeably true. There are many ways of being dishonest and as a general rule the Wellhausen critics use more caution than Dr. Skinner has done; but with a few striking exceptions they fall as far short of the standards of conduct observed by honorable laymen as does Dr. Skinner himself. As a result, I have been driven to adopt the course that I have followed in this instance to expose the methods by which the Wellhausen theory is maintained. If Dr. Gordon or any other critic finds this plain statement of fact unpalatable, the remedy for this state of affairs lies in his own hands. Let him take the works of the conservative writers

and tackle them honestly, grappling with each point in turn, refuting it or admitting its validity publicly. Then and only then will he have the right to pronounce our opinion as to who is or is not 'simple, sincere and absolutely candid.'"

That these are not random statements may be seen from an incident told by Eduard Hertlein in an essay on "Liberal Theology and Science" published in *Die Tat* as a sort of counter-reply to Jülicher's polemical essay on "The Placing of a Prussian Theological Seminary Under Guardianship." He exposes the falsity of the theory that liberalism stands for freedom of research and fair play. He says:

"Some years ago I wrote an article on the 12th chapter of Revelation. In it I showed that it was not at all necessary to see in this fragment a heathen myth; rather that one was only on the right track when one regarded it as an allegorical report concerning a persecution of the Christians. . . . From this point of view the theory that this old Christian document, glorifying a supernatural and not merely human Christ, was exceptional among contemporary documents, threatened to fall away. I placed my MSS. at the dis-

posal of one after another of the theological reviews which are generally supposed to serve the 'free' theology. Among the reasons for refusing to publish it, perhaps the most interesting was that the publishers did not wish to lose subscribers. It was probably also the most honest. But the others also gave me clearly to understand how difficult it is to publish anything in a scientific organ of the 'free' theology which goes against the current of the ordinary highly questionable (critical) methods."

"In his *History of the Criminal Law,* Sir James Fitzjames Stephens places on record the matured judgment of the Judicial Bench that no kind of evidence needs more the test of cross-examination than that of experts. In no other sphere save that of religious controversy would sensible people accept the dicta of experts until they had been thus tested; and yet the history of the higher criticism movement gives abundant proof that no class of experts is more untrustworthy than the critic."—Sir Robert Anderson, *The Bible and Modern Criticism.*

"At the bar we sometimes find a man's logic swamped by his learning; and so it is in theology." —Lord Hatherly (Lord Chancellor of England) in a letter to the Bishop of Durham.

"How can any man who cannot distinguish between a stone and a house, because he has first fuddled himself by calling both 'sanctuaries,' claim to speak with authority on complicated questions of historical development, or pretend to possess any insight into the meaning and working of institutions?"—Wiener, *The Origin of the Pentateuch.*

CHAPTER V

REQUISITES FOR THE QUEST OF TRUTH, CONTINUED—OBJECTIVISM AND GENERAL CULTURE

I mentioned *Sincerity* as the first requisite to the attainment of truth. No man can be trusted in a quest of this kind, unless his desire for truth be the controlling motive of the quest. If this desire be colored by the personal element of devotion to one's theory, by the disposition to make that theory itself the criterion of truth and personal satisfaction the end of its establishment, the mind will become opaque to the light. There will be no light to give out, for none can be received. Sincerity alone will furnish a transparent medium for the light of truth. This cannot exist where mixed motives prevail. The instances cited were intended to prove this. We cannot characterize as sincere a man who contends for a theory against facts; who clings to preconceived notions in the face of proof presented by his opponents and even refuses to consider such proof.

Cognate with this quality of sincerity is what I may call, for want of a better phrase, the *objective disposition*—the disposition to objectify the consciousness and consider the case from the viewpoint of the time, place and person whose history is in discussion. To present themes of the past, one must project himself among the people and scenes of the past. The realist is the true artist. "Paint me as I am, warts and all!" said Cromwell to the painter before whom he sat for a picture. An artist who designed to paint a Dutchman would not use an American for his model. During his student days the writer would occasionally visit the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. He recalls how amused he was at the anachronism of a painting of the Crucifixion. The artist was evidently a Dutchman, for his figures were Dutch; there was not a Jewish or Roman physiognomy on the canvas. There stood near the cross a typical Dutchman with medieval sword hanging by his side. The whole scene was subjective, and betrayed the artist's inability to objectify the scene and paint a real Jewish-Roman picture.

Not unlike this is the subjectivity of German and English rationalists who conceiving a theory of development for the history of Israel ignore Hebrew idioms and make the ancient Israelite talk and act like a modern Teuton. These men do not go to the Bible for a hypothesis; they take one to the Bible which is then expected to conform to it. One does not need to be a scholar, to see the absurdity of this. The subjective reasoning of the critics has nothing in common with the objective facts of Scripture, which have again and again proved to be the facts of archaeology. This reasoning, however dignified by a show of learning, is no better than that of the colored preacher who had evolved a critical theory of his own concerning the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites. He said the Red Sea had frozen over, and the Israelites crossed easily, but the Egyptians assaying to do so with their heavy chariots, broke through the ice and were drowned. One of his hearers objected that geography showed this took place in the tropics, and how could ice form in the tropics? The old darky was ready with his subjectivism. "I'se glad you axed dat question, caze it gibs me a chance to explain. You see dat war a

great while ago before dey had any geog'aphy, and before dare war any tropics."

So, as already stated, the critics originally declared the Pentateuch could not have been written by Moses, because that was a great while ago, before they had any writing and before there was any code of law; and they were no more correct than the colored preacher.

We may well adopt the language of the learned Jewish scholar of London, before mentioned, respecting a critical position he had demolished: "We can only express the hope that a time may come when some sympathy with the Hebrew genius and its methods of expression may be deemed an indispensable precondition of the task of producing a commentary on a Hebrew book." And Prof. Sayce strikingly remarks: "A document written in accordance with the critical requirements of a German professor can never have come to us from the ancient East."

The fatal objection to higher criticism is that it will not allow the Scriptures to speak for themselves. These are treated, to quote Prof. Orr, "like criminal suspects, whose every word is to be doubted unless hostile cross-examination fails to

shake it or independent confirmation of it can be produced. Like other witnesses the Bible writers are entitled to be heard with *prima facia* presumption of their honesty." No better answer to this subjective treatment of the Scriptures has been made than Prof. James Robertson's statement concerning the methods generally employed by those who advocate a very late date of large parts of the Pentateuch. These methods, he says, "are open to the objections, that they underrate the literary attainments and religious standing of earlier times, or undervalue the insight and guidance possessed by the sacred writers, or even do violence to the documents, by attributing to the authors a mode of writing history which seems artificial, and inconsistent with the manifest honesty and simplicity of purpose which they display." (*The Old Testament and Its Contents.*)

What Lessing says of the New Testament will apply with equal force to the Old Testament: "If now Livy and Dionysius and Polybius and Tacitus are treated so frankly and nobly that we do not put them to the rack for every syllable, why not also Matthew and Mark and Luke and John." The "why not" is too much

for the higher critics. Their ingenuity is a source of amusement rather than instruction to sensible people. When Wilfred Ward showed Huxley several different accounts of the Metaphysical Society and its doings, and pointed out a number of discrepancies between the accounts, the latter said, "Don't find any more or the German critics will prove that the Society never existed." There is scarcely a notable piece of writing in existence which could not by the method of higher criticism be resolved into divers independent fragments. It has been tried on an ode of Burns. He wrote the ode in April, 1786, and the incidents are known; but the application of certain canons of criticism disprove the facts and demand three men to do the work.

(Cited by Dr. Herbert W. Magoun in an able article—A Layman's View of the Critical History —in *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1913. Reference is also made to the manner in which a brilliant author touches "at every turn the weak spots of Homeric criticism." "By applying the methods of Robert, Bethe, Leaf, and Murray to poetry he has written himself, he shows that it is the work of many men in many ages.")

Prof. Mead, of Hartford, to expose the absurdity of subjective criticism, proved that the Epistle to the Romans consisted of several independent documents. The critics have carried the method so far that single sentences are cut to pieces and the fragments assigned to different authors. No man with ordinary good sense believes that this is anything but pure imagination.

The remark of Matthew Arnold is an apt description of the unreliability of such misnamed scholarship: "After all," he says, "shut a number of men up to make study and learning the business of their lives, and how many of them for want of some discipline or other, seem to lose all balance of judgment, all common sense."

Diversities of style and seeming contradictions are a large part of the stock in trade handled by the critics. Yet Dr. Heinrici, quoted by Professor Green, calls attention to Scherer's ingenious analysis of the Prologue of Faust in his Goethe Studies, as an instance of how precarious is the subjective method of determining the question of the authorship of a composition. Scherer proposed to explain the diversities of style and inner contradictions from "differences in the time of

composition and subsequent combination. And now the oldest manuscript of Faust has been published by Erich Schmidt, which proves that it was the 'young Goethe' who wrote the prologue at one effort essentially as it now stands. It is the same 'young Goethe' who speaks both in the ferment of youth and in a disillusioned old age."

Would the critics fare any better than Scherer did with his analysis of Goethe's Prologue, if the original manuscripts of these writings should turn up? As it is, the reason of the case is against them. The following additional examples are in point:

"No critic who might be given a complete set of the works of James Russell Lowell, all unknown to him, could consistently declare the Bigelow Papers and The Vision of Sir Launfal were written by the same man. But we know they were. Or if we took a historic drama of Shakespeare, where we know Beaumont entered into composite authorship with the great dramatist, what critic would confidently attempt the task of declaring the separate writings of each? Mr. Gladstone's literary style at eighty was quite different from that which marked his writings at thirty. Criti-

cism would hesitate that, according to its principles, one man had written both products from his pen."—Dr. Howard Agnew Johnston, *Bible Criticism and the Average Man.*

"Let the Indian Penal Code which was drafted by Macaulay be contrasted with the speeches and ballads of the same writer and similar divergencies of vocabulary and rhythm will at once become apparent. If it be urged that Macaulay came after a period of long literary development, I answer (1) that it is impossible to lay down narrow rules which no genius can transcend, and (2) that no man, however gifted, could have written "dooms" and speeches in the same vocabulary and rhythm and made a success of both. A man of genius who found himself confronted with such very different tasks could not avoid creating the means of executing them. In a word, I conceive that in each case the style was merely a tool forged by Moses for the accomplishment of his purpose."—Wiener, *The Origin of the Pentateuch.*

Another requisite to the attainment of truth, especially in a matter of this kind, is *General Culture.* I may illustrate by an incident I once read

about. A French farmer was standing in an art gallery before a painting of a bridleless horse that was foaming at the mouth. The artist whose painting it was being near and observing the farmer laugh, came up and asked him what he was laughing at. He replied, "At the fool who made that picture." "Why," exclaimed the artist, "it is the greatest success of the season; everybody is talking about it." The farmer simply said, "Any fool ought to know that a horse does not foam at the mouth unless he has a bit in it." It is said the artist immediately had the picture taken down.

That painter, like the higher critic, had a great deal of technical knowledge and could paint, which the farmer could not do, but the latter had a kind of knowledge which the artist needed to avoid making "a fool of himself" when he set about painting a horse. He pursued the subjective method of the critics—conceiving nothing to be something and then publishing it as a fact. The statement of Prof. Willis J. Beecher will sufficiently emphasize the importance of this qualification for Bible study and criticism:

"It would be difficult to imagine anything more mischievous than this notion that experts in

scholarship are the only persons qualified to pass on biblical problems. Into these problems enter questions that depend on one's knowledge of Hebrew or Syriac, or of Oriental antiquities; but into them also enter even more importantly questions of ordinary living, questions of sentiment, all sorts of questions of human experience. A learned man who lacks religious sympathy, and lacks shrewdness and experiences in human living is less well equipped for Bible study than the unlearned person who has these qualifications."

The *Saturday Evening Post* relates an incident concerning Senator William P. Frye, of Maine, and Agassiz the scientist, which shows the irresistible force of fact when weighed against theory. On one occasion the Senator, after returning from his summer outing to the Penobscot woods of Maine, met the celebrated naturalist to whom he described his experience. "Among the triumphs," he said, "was the capture of a speckled trout that weighed fully eight pounds." Dr. Agassiz smiled and said: "Reserve that for the credulous and convivial circles of the rod and reel celebrants, but spare the feelings of a sober scientist."

"This is not a campaign whopper I'm telling; I weighed that trout carefully, and it was an eight pounder."

"My dear Mr. Frye," remonstrated Agassiz, "permit me to inform you that *salvalinus fontinalis* never attains that extraordinary weight. The creature you caught could not have been a speckled trout. All the authorities on ichthyology would disprove your claim."

"All that I can say to that," replied Senator Frye, "is that there are, then, bigger fish in Maine than are dreamed of in your noble science." As they parted, the Senator added: "If you will establish a summer school somewhere under the shadows of Mount Katahdin, I'll wager that it will not be long before you will have occasion to alter your text-books."

The next season found the Maine statesman at his usual avocation in the Maine woods. One day he caught a speckled trout that weighed nine pounds. He packed it in ice and sent it to his friend Agassiz. A few days later he went to the station where he received his mail and telegrams. One of the latter was a message from the great

scientist, which read: "The science of a lifetime kicked to death by a fact. Agassiz."

The application to the critics is evident.

"The procedure of the critics in treating the sources so arbitrarily, and at the same time wanting to draw a faithful historical picture, is a *contradictio in adjecto* and forfeits *a priori* every pretence to credibility."—Möller, *Are the Critics Right?* p. 146.

"The ark sometimes fell into the hands of the Philistines, but the Philistines could not do anything with the ark of God. It was of no use to them. Sooner or later they must hand it back to Israel. The interpretation of Scripture will receive no benefit or light worth speaking of, but from the Church of Jesus Christ herself. . . . The real light on the Scripture can only proceed from those who, by the selfsame Holy Ghost which breathed the Scriptures, have been taught to believe the things that are contained in the Scriptures."—Adolph Saphir, *The Divine Unity of Scripture.*

"It is ignorance of Christ which turns the Scriptures into a dark, inexplicable riddle."—Birks's *Modern Rationalism.*

CHAPTER VI

REQUISITES FOR THE QUEST OF TRUTH (CONTINUED)—HIGHER CRITICISM EXPOSED IN THE LIGHT OF COMMON SENSE

From what has already been advanced, it is evident that higher critics are not as competent to deal with this question as men whose judgment is balanced by qualities lacking in the former. If there were nothing but plain common sense to guide deliberation, it would be sufficient to condemn the absurd and wicked assumptions of higher criticism and utterly to wipe out its conclusions. Of this quality in relation to the subject I wish now to speak.

First, then, in opposition to the spirit and reasoning of higher criticism, common sense dictates that *the Bible should have a square deal*—that it should be allowed to speak for itself. The critics as a class are too busy trying to establish a conjectural hypothesis to think with candor upon the words of Scripture. "The entrance of Thy words

giveth light." But light is for the eye, whose power of vision depends on freedom from the morbific influence of prepossession. The first condition of moral perception is a mind divested of prejudice, openness to light. To such a mind the Scriptures will demonstrate their harmony and truthfulness. The experience of Dr. Howard Kelly of Johns Hopkins University, is a striking illustration of the fact stated. This eminent physician and scientist writes: "I have within the last twenty years of my life come out of uncertainty and doubt into faith which is an absolute dominating conviction of the truth and about which I have not the shadow of doubt." Once profoundly disturbed about the traditional faith and floundering in the bog of higher criticism, he got out by this means: *"One day it occurred to me to see what the Book had to say for itself."* The result was, he firmly believed the Bible to be the inspired word of God, and that Jesus Christ is the Divine Saviour of the world. How reasonable the method, how simple the process of reaching certainty concerning the Scriptures, and how glorious the personal consequence!

Allied with this thought is the proposition that common sense affirms *it is unfair to treat the Bible, as in no sense different from other literature.* The Bible claims to be the product not of human sagacity and foresight, but of Divine inspiration, and to be, therefore, a supernatural revelation which was miraculously attested. As such it is entitled to a chance to vindicate itself not only by such principles of ratiocination as apply to it in common with other literature, but also by those peculiar marks and accompaniments which pertain alone to a Divine revelation.

Hence to bring to the study of the Scriptures the settled notion that "there is no true prophecy," and "no true miracle," is to prejudge the case and rule oneself out of court as incompetent to proceed with the work of investigation. This is exactly what the originators of higher criticism have done, and if professed evangelicals who have joined this school still assert allegiance to a Divine revelation, they do so inconsistently with the fundamental arguments of the school; they do, in fact, cast away the substance of inspiration and substitute the kernel of rationalistic criticism, retaining only the shell of orthodoxy.

Two things are observable of these followers of Wellhausen & Co.—they ignore not merely the governing purpose of the sacred writer, but the promised agency of the Divine Spirit in the production of his work, and they take no account of the *spiritual character* of the Scriptures. They treat the Scriptures as uninspired, in the peculiar sense asserted therein, and as secular—in a word, as distinctly human writings with all the limitations of such writings and none of the safeguards assured by divine agency. The New as well as the Old Testament suffers by this emasculation. The apostles are turned against Christ, and Christ Himself is robbed of authority. It means nothing that Christ declared His apostles should be guided into all truth by the Holy Spirit, if their writings contradict His teachings or are not in the highest sense authoritative. Nothing? It wipes out the idea of inspiration and leaves us without a revelation.

The low, secular notion concerning the Scriptures, conceived by the critics, is a flagrant cause of false reasoning and renders impossible a correct understanding of these writings. We meet this wrong conception and erroneous reasoning at

every turn. Two examples will sufficiently emphasize one of the serious deficiencies of higher criticism. Reference has been made to the interchangeable use of certain names. By this it is not implied that such a use of names was arbitrary. Higher critics make the mention of such names the basis of their documentary theory, but common sense finds in the spiritual character of the Scriptures a convincing reason why the same writer should employ different terms and phrases in his treatment of a subject. The names which designate the Divine Being—Elohim (God) and Jehovah (Lord)—are in point. The former is His *creative* name, the name which describes His original relation to the work of creation while the latter sets forth His personal unfolding to that work, His covenant, redemptive character. Hence, the inspired author of Genesis would use Elohim only in the first chapter, but would need, in subsequent chapters, another designation also, because he was to bring out additional aspects of the Divine character.

The other example, to be adduced as evincing the want of discernment on the part of these critics, is the account of certain features of the

Tabernacle. Wellhausen, notwithstanding express statements in Maccabees that the golden altar and golden table were both carried away by Antiochus Epiphanes and renewed at the feast of dedication, questions the existence of an altar of incense, even in the second temple, the chief ground of his denial being the fact that in Exodus the command for the making of the altar of incense does not appear where we might expect it, in chapters 25-29, but at the commencement of chapter 30. The explanation for this order is Divine and cannot be seen by those who find only a human development with no typical or prophetic outlook in the Levitical Economy. The altar of incense represented the priestly ministration of worship which could take place only after the events symbolized by the other parts of the tabernacle; hence this altar could be made only after the other pieces of furniture. The entire tabernacle teaches the Divine process of man's recovery from sin to God, through incarnation and atonement, the Lord God coming out of His holy place (where the Ark of the Covenant with its mediating mercy seat lay hid) through the outer sanctuary (where the

golden candlestick and table of shewbread stood for the "Light of the World" and the "Bread of Life," the essential nature of the incarnate God) to the meeting place between the sinner and God, at the brazen altar (typifying the Cross) where the sin-bearer dies and the ground of reconciliation is effected. On this ground the high priest (who typifies Jesus Christ) can institute worship in His church (altar of incense) and shed light by His Spirit (candlestick) and become food (shewbread) to believers. Christ could not enter upon His priestly ministry till He had made an atonement for sin, but as He had no sin to be washed away Himself, the laver of regeneration does not appear in the order of the typical system till after the altar of incense. So believers are reconciled at the cross before they can truly worship; but as they have sin to be cleansed away as well as sins to be forgiven, they must be regenerated as well as reconciled; hence the placing of the laver for the priesthood of believers after the high priest has made atonement and passed within the vail to appear in the presence of God for us.

Sir Robert Anderson has truly said: "Not a single student of prophecy can be found in the

ranks of the critics; not a single individual who understands the Pentateuch as 'the word of the beginning of Christ.' In other words, the critics know nothing of typology of Scripture. And therefore they are ignorant of the language in which Christian doctrine is taught in the New Testament."

All this glorious, symbolical teaching is nothing to them; and theological professors and Christian ministers who adopt their premises and promulgate their conclusions stultify their profession and betray the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. Their protestations of loyalty to the truth are vain. They must be judged by the logical and practical results of their alliance with the deniers of the faith. Dr. Clarke, whose lectures on the *Use of the Scriptures* might more appropriately be described as the *abuse of the Scriptures,* is a conspicuous example of men who sit in the chairs of Christian institutions and play into the hands of outspoken enemies of a Divine Revelation. In this book Dr. Clarke asserts, "We have no historical narrative of the beginning of sin, and theology receives from the Scriptures no record of that beginning," and goes on to reject the entire sacri-

ficial system of the Old Testament as having no relevancy to New Testament teaching and no bearing on Christian theology.

Even He who "spake as never man spake" is not spared from this wholesale repudiation of Scripture narratives. The position is taken that Christ taught ignorantly concerning His literal, personal return to the earth; that His "foresight" was "limited," and that "the advent hope expressed in genuine words of Jesus" has "no place at all in the gift and revelation of Christ, and therefore our principle requires us to drop it and all that belongs to it out of our Christian theology." This is the sum of his reasoning: "Visible advent, simultaneous resurrection, assemblage of all men for judgment, millennial reign of Christ on earth,—all is Jewish survival, historically discredited by the work of Christ Himself; it is a remainder from pre-Christian life and hope, demonstrated to be non-Christian by the different course of Christian history; wherefore it forms no part of Christian theology."

Thus this man, miscalled Christian teacher, takes his place with "the scoffers in the last days, saying, where is the promise of His coming, for

since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." Dr. Clarke changes the apostle's phraseology a bit, but his denial is identical with that of infidel scoffers; the promise of Christ's coming has been discredited by the course of history! But the last word of history has not been written yet, and Dr. Clarke and his kind will one day realize the truth of the solemn declaration: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." As an attempt to be irenical, to make the new theology popular, this book of Dr. Clarke's is of a piece with the worst anti-Christian writing of the times and forms a scandalous mess of assumption and superficial reasoning. Infinitely superior to this "darkening of counsel by words without knowledge" is the strong, common sense view of old Thomas Erskine of Linlathen. In his discourse on the *Freeness of the Gospel* he says:

"It is impossible to look into the Bible with the most ordinary attention without feeling that we have got into a moral atmosphere quite different from that which we breathe in the world and in the world's literature. In the Bible God is presented as doing everything and as being the cause

and end of everything; and man appears only as he stands related to God, either as a revolted creature or as the subject of Divine grace. Whereas in the world, and in the books which contain the history of the world, according to its own judgment, man appears to be everything and there is as little reference to God as if there were no such being in the universe."

Common sense recognizes this difference and exalts the Word of God. The crime of higher criticism is that it eliminates God from the Bible and exalts the critic.

"Wellhausen, whom others have followed, professes (Prolegomena, p. 14) to have learned from Vatke 'the most and the best'; but the latter arrived at his construction of history not by unprejudiced historical investigation, but from his purely dogmatic preconceptions on the philosophy of religion."—Möller, *Are the Critics Right?* p. 213.

"In Wellhausen's review of the history, he has much to say of the gradual rise of feasts from the presentation of first-fruits, and of their annual observance at neighborhood sanctuaries, and the growth of larger sanctuaries towards the close of the period of the Judges. . . . But the whole thing is spun out of his own brain. It is as purely fictitious as any astronomical map would be of the other side of the moon."—Prof. W. H. Green.

"The fact remains that other branches of the Semitic family ran into mythology, while the Hebrew race alone was preserved from it."—Professor James Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel.*

CHAPTER VII

REQUISITES FOR THE QUEST OF TRUTH (CONTINUED)—HIGHER CRITICISM EXPOSED IN THE LIGHT OF COMMON SENSE

Common sense while recognizing the difference between the Bible and the world's literature is quick to perceive the absurdity of the reasoning of higher critics when tried upon the latter. Examples were cited to show how the documentary hypothesis of the critics is demolished by the application of its principles to a writing known to be the work of a single hand. The fact that it is possible by this method to make such a writing consist of the work of several authors utterly discredits that hypothesis and confirms the strong evidence supporting the Biblical position. The self-assurance of higher critics is their most notable characteristic. When they are through with the Bible, it is more wonderful than Joseph's coat. They resolve writings that possess many marks of unity into a patch-work of numerous

authors—even reducing sentences into fragments with manifold origin—and proclaim their product true history. We suggest they try their skill on some piece of literature that is the joint work of two or more hands, and point out the parts composed by each hand. Not one of them would assume to dogmatize concerning the Besant and Rice novels as they do about the Pentateuch and other portions of the Old Testament. Here is fiction whose dual authorship they cannot detect. Yet they are cock-sure that the Pentateuch is the work of many authors and editors and that the various fragments must be assigned to this, that, and the other unknown person, designated symbolically as J, E, JE, D, JED, J-1, J-2, J-3, etc., P-1, P-2, P-3, etc., R, R-1, R-2, R-3, etc., etc., with no limit set to this addition. Common sense is indispensable to a sane, sober criticism and is one of the strongest guarantees of the triumph of conservative Biblical scholarship.

G. K. Chesterton, the acute English novelist, essayist, critic and philosopher attacks the higher critics in a leading magazine under the sarcastic caption of "High-Brows and Humbugs," and with merciless logic lays bare their "quackery."

He declares that the spirit of higher criticism "is, in its collective quality, a spirit of hypocrisy and impudence. Its principle is to demand for indecision the most abject worship that was ever offered to certitude." He hits the homage paid to higher critics in this fashion: "Those who sit at the feet of the higher critics in literature use the language of liberty because it is almost imposed on them by law; but their true atmosphere is not liberty or even of the search after truth. They do not believe by choice. They doubt by authority." Mr. Chesterton's argument embraces an analysis of "a learned and skeptical article" on the story of Lady Godiva which, he says, "contains every one of the vanities, stupidities and falsehoods with which I am taxing what is called the higher criticism."

Another example of good lay sense is the following Canadian newspaper's reply to a destructive critic and university professor:—

"One of the constant sources of amusement to every journalist is furnished by the mistakes of the critics who think they can pick out the work of the various writers on a newspaper. Unless there is some special circumstance to guide them, they

are apt to be astray three times out of four. With these examples of the fallibility of literary criticism, the average journalist will not be disposed to 'take much stock' in the claim of the higher critics to be able to carve up the books of the Old Testament among a number of mythical authors and collaborators, claiming that this chapter of Genesis was from one source and that from another, that this portion of Isaiah is by one author and that by some other, as Dr. George Coulson Workman asserts they can do, in a series of articles which he is writing for the "Canadian Magazine.' While our critics cannot determine the authorship of much current literature, while they cannot decide who wrote the letters of Junius, or whether or not Shakespeare or Bacon wrote the famous plays, though they have abundance of circumstantial evidence to work upon, they are asking too much when they expect the world to give up the traditional view of the Scriptures and accept their fantastic and far-fetched theories. Let the critics show that they can solve some of the literary mysteries of the present or the immediate past before they undertake to dogmatize as

to the composition of books written thousands of years ago."

Common sense notes the strength of the argument from PROBABILITY in favor of the conservative position. So strong is this argument that it amounts to a moral certainty against the subjective theorizing of higher criticism, stamping the conclusions of this school as incredible. It is not probable that the Hebrews whose lofty monotheistic faith distinguished them from all other nations, borrowed from the Babylonians the matter contained in the early narratives of Genesis. It seems to be a settled policy of higher critics when any ground for comparison arises between Hebrew literature and tradition and those of other nations, to hold that the Hebrews were the borrowers. This is incredible for the reason stated. Well may we ask with Prof. James Robertson: "Why should we not admit a common primeval tradition, when it is thus attested by independent witnesses? Nay, seeing that the Hebrew tradition, at the very earliest point at which we can seize it, is purer and loftier than any other, why should it be at all incredible that in that race, from pre-Abrahamic times and in the lands from which

the faith of Abraham was disseminated, there were found purer conceptions of God and deeper intuitions into His character and operations than we find elsewhere—glimmerings of a purer faith which had elsewhere become obscured by polytheistic notions and practices? Do not the results of the study of comparative religion tend to show that even polytheism is an aberration from a simpler conception, and that the lowest forms of nature—religion point to a belief in a Being whose character always transcends the forms in which the untutored mind tries to represent Him, and is not summed up in all their attempts to give it expression? That being so, why should it be a thing incredible that in one quarter, a quarter which in the clear light of history is found to stand sharply defined from its surroundings, the souls of the best should have kept themselves above these degradations, and nursed within themselves the higher, purer, more primary conception; and that this should have taken shape in the faith of Abraham, or if we state it otherwise, formed the basis on which the purer faith of Abraham was reared? This will not seem incredible to any who believe that there is *one* God and that He has been

the same from the beginning." (*Early Religion of Israel.*) The same writer observes, in his text-book, *The Old Testament and Its Contents:* "If the Hebrew writers have thus preserved so pure an account of the manner in which God formed the material world, we may give all the more credence to them when they speak of God's dealings with man in history, which is their main theme."

And if it be credible that this pure and lofty tradition passed on with other remains of the primeval revelation to the time of Moses what could be more probable than that this man, whose wisdom, learning, and force of character preeminently fitted him to be both lawgiver and historian, should be selected by Almighty God to make a record of the facts known and revealed to him? Certainly no one in any subsequent age was better prepared or a more likely instrument for this great work than he.

The probability of such a selection is enhanced to the point of certainty by the "psychological and historical incredibilities" with which the critical theory is loaded. These are too numerous for mention here. We are asked to believe, for ex-

ample, that the entire wilderness legislation with portable tabernacle and practices was the fabrication of a time and place wherein it would be impossible of realization; that a work assumed to have originated in the age of Josiah with a view to effect the centralization of worship, omitted all mention of Jerusalem and features of the temple service introduced by David; and that—many other incredibilities which refute the theory and establish the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

Prof. Green has put some of these incredible situations so well that we quote: "Laws are never issued to regulate a state of things which has passed away ages before and can by no possibility be revived. What are we to think, then, of a hypothesis which assigns the code of Deuteronomy to the reign of Josiah, or shortly before it, when its injunction to exterminate the Canaanites and the Amalekites, who had long since disappeared, would be as utterly out of date as a law in New Jersey at the present time offering a bounty for killing wolves and bears or royal proclamation in Great Britain ordering the expulsion of the Danes? A law contemplating foreign conquests

would have been absurd when the urgent question was whether Judah could maintain its own existence againt the encroachments of Babylon and Egypt. A law discriminating against Ammon and Moab, in favor of Edom had its warrant in the Mosaic period, but not in the time of the later kings. Jeremiah discriminates precisely the other way, promising a future restoration to Moab and Ammon which he denies to Edom who is also to Joel, Obadiah, and Isaiah the representative foe of God's people. . . . . The allusions to Egypt imply familiarity with and recent residence in that land. . . . . And how can a code belong to the time of Josiah, which, while it contemplates the possible selection of a king in the future nowhere implies an actual regal government, but vests the supreme central authority in a judge and the priesthood, which lays special stress on the requirements that the king must be a native and not a foreigner, when the undisputed line of succession had for ages been fixed in the family of David, and that he must not 'cause the people to return to Egypt' as they seemed ready to do on every grievance in the days of Moses, but which

no one ever dreamed of doing after they were fairly established in Canaan?"

But the critics must somehow explain the barefaced forgeries, and this is Wellhausen's venture:

"One can characterize the entire Priestly Code as the wilderness legislation, inasmuch as it abstracts from the natural conditions and motives of the actual life of the people in the land of Canaan, and rears the hierocracy on the *tabula rasa* of the wilderness, the negation of nature, by means of the bald statutes of arbitrary absolutism."

Now this is not history; it is *fiction,* unmixed with suggestions of reality, such as invested Scott's historical romances with the shadow of credibility. This is to abolish history and substitute conjecture for fact. It is, moreover, to require us to believe that the time of Israel's decadence and corruption was the most auspicious time to originate an extensive religious code, for which there is no parallel in the history of mankind. On the contrary, every example of national and religious growth and decay disproves the supposition.

"If the great events of the Exodus, the conquest of Canaan, and in general the experiences which had made them a nation did not impress the national consciousness when it was plastic and fresh, are we to suppose that, for the first time when foreign nations were about to sweep them away, they began to read into their worship and ceremonial a meaning which had not occurred to them for centuries? If at a time when Hosea and Amos were reminding them of the days of the youth of the nation, and thus appealing to the strongest motives that could influence them—if at such a time there were many feasts and imposing rituals, are we to suppose that not once in all these was there a commemoration of the founding of the nation, and of the achievement of the nation's success? No doubt the feasts, at such times as those of Hosea and Amos, would be overlaid with superstitious observances. But that is not the point. Because the modern Greeks at Jerusalem make Easter a time of riot, are we to conclude that Easter does not commemorate the resurrection? What country has not at one time or another, thus buried its holiest associations under carnal and sensuous forms? All this does not suffice to show that the

better meaning does not underlie the institution; much less that a better meaning is merely an afterthought, read into an empty form, just because it is empty. Forms are never empty in the strict sense. They are full of something. The corrupt must be purged out before the clean can be poured in; and we can find no time in Israel's history at which a *tabula rasa* was formed, and history made out of nothing." (Prof. Robertson's *Early Religion of Israel.*)

The same learned author, in this masterpiece of reasoning, convicts the critics of falsifying history in the following cogent manner:—

"The men who moulded the history of Israel were the men who had most to do with the production and preservation of the national literature. We know what sort of men they were. But on the modern theory, the greatest characters in Israel's history, instead of being spontaneous actors in a great life drama, are merely posturing and acting a part on a stage. What they give us as history is merely their fond idea of what history should have been; in many cases it is not even

so much, but pure invention to give a show of antiquity to what had to be accounted for and magnified in their own day. History was never made in this way. Men that make history such as Israel's history was, are intent on great purposes, moved by noble ends; but what we are asked to contemplate at the great crises and turning-points is a set of men thinking how they will elaborate a scheme of history. Fictions become the greatest facts, and the French critic has carried out the theory to its true conclusion when he ascribes the great bulk of the Hebrew literature to the free creation of a school of theologians after the exile."

Common sense holds it is incredible that prophetic teaching should precede the priestly legislation. The natural order is always the reverse of this. Principles of law and religion are first laid down and then arise those whose duty it is to expound and apply those principles. The prophets were reformers, not originators. When the national conscience became lax and religious worship degenerated into formalism or idolatry, the

prophets denounced, not the national ordinances of religion, but their perversion, and emphasized the spirit of worship as that which made the form acceptable. To quote Dr. Adolph Saphir:

"But what had the judges and the prophets to do but to refer back again to that perfect revelation which God had given to them, in Moses? And if it had not been for that revelation through Moses, and for a written record of that revelation which was acknowledged to be authentic, Samuel and all the prophets would have been utterly helpless and without strength, in the face of an idolatrous and sinful nation. . . . Their watchword was 'Repentance.' 'Seek ye out the old paths.' 'Remember the law which my servant Moses gave unto you on Mount Horeb.' "

The critical contention that the priestly legislation followed the work of the prophets contradicts the insistence with which they point to a better sacrifice and a better cleansing for heart and conscience than the blood of bulls and goats. If they continually looked beyond the Levitical sacrifices to something which these sacrifices foreshadowed, how can they be placed before the sacrificial system? They were the true expos-

itors of the system, unfolding its typical nature and announcing its spiritual destination.

There is one argument so void of respectability that we almost feel like apologizing for its reproduction here. Yet it is worth while to expose the straits to which the critics are driven to make out a case. *The argument is that which arises against the genuineness of certain writings from their violation or non-observance.* Universal history could be falsified by this reasoning. A noted instance of its shallowness occurs in the case of the laws and institutions of Charlemagne, which had disappeared before the close of the century in which he died. "Those who have studied the charters, laws, and chronicles of the later Carlovingian Princes most diligently are unanimous in declaring that they indicate either an absolute ignorance or an entire forgetfulness of the legislation of Charlemagne." The remarkable case of the loss and finding of the original manuscript of Luther's lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, is also in point. All Europe had been ransacked to locate it. From one library after another, says Professor Johann Ficker of the University of

Strasburg, who conducted the search, the royal library at Berlin included, came the report that no trace of it was to be found. Yet several years later he was astonished to be informed that the manuscript whose existence in answer to his written inquiries, had been specifically denied (and for a copy of which he had made three trips to Rome) was in the Berlin library, in a show case!

Does this bear any likeness to the finding of the Book of the Law in the Temple during the reign of Josiah, which the critics would have us believe is a forgery, though it purports to be the work of Moses and with a wilderness framework of legislation out of date and place in that late age?

If the argument from the non-observance or violation of law is valid against its existence, the work of the Protestant Reformer can be shown to be a fabrication upon a hypothetical doctrine, and the writings of Paul share with those of Moses the stigma of lying imposture.

These are specimens of the learned nonsense by which it is sought to make an end of the Bible as

an authoritative revelation of God, in the interests of sheer naturalism. They could be multiplied, but no purpose would be served by the act.

"If lying and deception have a share every time that new forces arise in the development, it is only a well-meant self-deception to believe that we can hold to a revelation along with this; this self-deception must, however, be the more unhesitatingly exposed the more dangerous it is, and the more, under its protection, the foundation on which wé stand is undermined."—Möller, *Are the Critics Right?*

"I am struck with the absence of any sign of an experience distinctively Christian in many of those who discuss the sanctuaries of the Christian faith. . . . Some of these scholars, to judge from their writings alone, do not seem even so much as to have heard of a Holy Ghost. And they have a fatal dread of pietism and methodism, and most forms of intensely personal evangelical faith. They are, like Haeckel, in their own way, the victims of an intellectualism which means spiritual atrophy to Christianity at last."—Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ,* p. 195.

CHAPTER VIII

REQUISITES FOR THE QUEST OF TRUTH (CONTINUED)—HIGHER CRITICISM EXPOSED IN THE LIGHT OF COMMON SENSE

Common Sense affirms that the Bible writers were honest men and that their writings are free from make-believe. THE CRITICAL THEORY HOLDS THERE CAN BE HONEST FORGERIES! The Deuteronomic and Priestly writings were fabricated "in the interest of a religious propaganda." The view is not that these writings contain inadvertencies, unintentional mistakes, or that they "are avowedly religious fiction, parables, stories framed for religious teaching, and so understood from the first," but that "the D. and P. writers deliberately published what purported to be history," when in fact "this alleged history was largely invented for the purpose of making it appear, falsely, that certain religious ideas and practices of their own invention had existed from ancient times, and had been handed

down to them;" that they "deliberately promulgated an untrue history of the religion of Israel, with the intention of having it accepted as true." "One has got to choose," forcibly remarks Prof. Willis J. Beecher, whose statement of the modern view we have quoted, "between this and the opinion that the Scriptures are truthful; he cannot hold both."

Protest as they may, those who accept the contentions of Wellhausen, Driver & Co., nullify their profession of faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and make the eternal Spirit a party to the most stupendous fraud in the history of the world. It is the habit of such writers to talk of different standards of literary honesty in those days. It is sufficient to reply that men like Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Ezra and Zachariah who lived when these Old Testament frauds are said to have been perpetrated were "as capable of distinguishing between truth and falsehood, as conscious of the sin of deceit, as jealous for the honor of God, as incapable of employing lying lips or a lying pen in the service of Jehovah as any of our critics today." Equally strong words are needed to characterize that strange perversion of

reason and conscience that leads a man to write, as does the author of "Inspiration and the Bible," that tho' certain Epistles should be forgeries, they have "an intrinsic value" that they "remain a possession for the church, a light and an instruction, a revelation tho' the writer should be some unknown disciple of the great apostle, who wrote *as he was moved by the Holy Ghost but preferred to write under the name of his Master rather than obtruding his own personality.*" To the exclamation of the astonished Bible reader that "this questioning of Pauline authorship would represent the letters as forgeries and impostures," he says: "The answer of that difficulty is to be found in the better knowledge of the literary practice of the Ancient World. It is perfectly certain that a disciple of St. Paul, anxious to communicate his Master's teaching to the churches would not hesitate to veil his own hand under the form of a letter from his Master; what we should call 'forgery' he would call modesty."

Now, to say nothing of the difficulty of getting churches that were familiar with Pauline Epistles to receive as genuine an imposture, it is *not* "perfectly certain" that a disciple of Paul or any other

person with a conscience enlightened and purified by the Spirit of God, would forge a writing and call it "modesty." It is morally inconceivable that there should have been a different standard of ethics in the apostolic or post-apostolic church when the Holy Spirit manifested the presence and power of God in such intensity and illumination, than in the modern church when Christian ministers and teachers can calmly write such a libel against Him. The case of Ananias and Sapphira shows how far from moving men to write a lie was the Spirit of truth and holiness. The balance is in favor of the early church. The claim of Dr. Horton and the rest of the school is utterly erroneous and preposterous, and would leave us no ethical standard whatever. For if the New Testament cannot furnish us such a standard, we would look in vain for one. How portentous to the church and religious life of the future is such a perversion of New Testament ethics, it is not difficult to see. We denounce such teaching as Satanic and destructive of the very foundations of faith, and we refuse to have fellowship with those who lend themselves to its propagation.

These remarks demand increased emphasis

when applied to our Lord's positive declarations concerning those books of the Old Testament which the critics assert are forgeries. It is one of the surest marks of moral eclipse when men profess faith in the Son of God and yet make Him perpetuate what on their theory is a fraud. As Bishop Copleston, late Metropolitan of India, said: "It is hardly possible to imagine any accumulation of probabilities of the lower kind which would not be brushed away in a moment by the improbability that Almighty God should have used a conscious literary forgery for the purpose for which He has used the book of Deuteronomy."

Finally, *common sense judges the modern view by its fruits which are plainly evil.* It rejects this pretentious reasoning of the critics because it destroys evangelical faith and divests the church of real spiritual power.

Every age has its own needs and demands a message suited to the hour. But the same message may be required again and again, for there is often a recrudescence of error. This fact makes the Bible perennially fresh. The polemics of Paul and John are as vital and applicable today as when they were delivered against the legalists

and Gnostics of the 1st century. It is sometimes said by way of apology for the critical assaults on the integrity of the Holy Scriptures that changed conditions call for a re-statement of the truth. But it is the truth, not its semblance or substitute, that must be stated again. Truth never changes; but error assumes new guises and is to be met not by some new theory about the truth, but by the naked reality.

It is the failure to insist upon this fact and the folly of compromising the claims of truth, that frequently accounts for "changed conditions." There would be no occasion for the feverish haste observed in some institutions to adjust views concerning the Bible to the conclusions of a rationalistic criticism, if those who are set for the defense and confirmation of the truth would keep the faith and refuse to surrender the principle of inspiration or to soften its claims. The Bible would vindicate itself as the directing power of every epoch and the solution of every problem. I have a conviction that the overmastering question in our day is not social, but biblical; not whether they are social exigencies, but whether there will soon be anything to meet them.

Dr. Forsyth, in the work above mentioned, thus speaks in the chapter on "The Preacher and the Age:" "I say that in the present state of the Church, and certainly for the sake of the pulpit, its ministers, and its future, theology is a greater need than philanthropy. Because men do not know where they are. They are only steering by dead reckoning—when anything may happen. But theology is 'taking the sun.' And it is wonderful—it is dangerous—how few of our officers can use the sextant for themselves. Yet what is the use of captains who are more at home entertaining the passengers than navigating the ship. The theology of the Bible is but the moral adequacy and virility of the word of the Cross and the thews of a powerful Gospel. A theology chiefly curious or speculative, a secondary theology, may be left to the leisure of the schools; but a theology of experienced Grace, primary theology, is of the essence of the Gospel. And it is not merely of the *bene esse,* it is of the *esse* of the Church."

To think the problems of the hour can be solved by an emasculated Bible is the madness of casting away the sheet anchor in the midst of a

storm. One of the most solemn reminders of this fact is the sad confession of Dr. Marcus Dods, a distinguished Scotch critic, whose experience illustrates the disintegrating effect of this system of thought.

Among the published letters are found these expressions: "I am a backslider. I used to enjoy prayer, but for years I have found myself dumb. Of course one can always make a prayer, but prayer in the sense of asking for things has not been in my case a proved force. I pray now not because my own experience gives me any encouragement, but because of Christ's example and command. I wish I could live as a spectator through the next generation to see what they are going to make of things. There will be a grand turnup in matters theological, and the churches won't know themselves fifty years hence. It is to be hoped some little rag of faith may be left when all is done. For my own part I am sometimes entirely under water and see no sky at all."

This confirms our thought regarding the question of the hour. Can we cope with the complicated situation of modern social life if we substitute for an infallible, authoritative revelation a

mere patchwork of men's devising with scarcely "a rag of faith left," and with nothing at all to make the dull conscience of the age respond to higher issues? There is coming on a generation of preachers and thinkers to whom the inspiration of Isaiah and of Paul is not different from that of any great genius; who regard the Bible as part of the world's literature, nothing more, and who are uncertain about the great facts of sin and redemption and the miraculous elements these involve; mere negative characters confronted by positive problems and without a vital, saving message for a perishing world. Any one can see that if there has been no moral fall, no spiritual ruin as the Scriptures teach, there is no demand for the miraculous system of the New Testament, no basis for the virgin birth of Christ, no such meaning to sin as would necessitate the principle and fact of expiation, as the atonement has been understood by the profoundest thinkers of the past. The integrity of the New Testament is bound up with the historical character of the Old Testament, especially with those very portions which the critics declare are derived from "the raw material of myth and legend" (Prof. Geo.

Adam Smith). Any reverent mind can see that the Bible is a vast remedial scheme for an awful catastrophe in the life of man; that the early chapters of Genesis contain the only consistent, reliable account of that catastrophe; and that throughout the Bible there runs a great purpose in the call and separation of individuals, in the organization of a nation with certain religious rites and phenomena, and through that nation the coming of an unparalleled character with a teaching and a mission positively declared to be the answer to what is recorded as fact in the Pentateuch. Now if the evolutionary hypothesis of the critics be true; if there has been no fall of man, but on the contrary a gradual development from a state of animalism, and if the religious history of Israel has been simply a human rather than a supernatural development, what becomes of the entire New Testament claim? Can Christianity as set before us in the Gospels and Epistles rest upon fiction? Can the solemn mystery of the Cross have an adequate explanation in the allegorizing fancy of uninspired men who dealt in myths and legends? The whole New Testament is resolved into a series of pictures,

"As idle as a painted ship
Upon a painted ocean."

And those self-styled evangelicals who deny with the critics the historical character of the Genesis narratives, are self-stultified when they profess belief in the fact of redemption as taught in the New Testament. They only are consistent who go with the radicals all the way and reject *in toto* the doctrine of *inspiration and the facts of man's creation in holiness and subsequent fall into sin and ruin.*

This is why Socinianism is taking possession of many whose church connection involves an obligation to maintain doctrines they no longer unhesitatingly accept. And this is why, if the remark of Dr. Bitting, Baptist pastor in St. Louis, be true, "there will never be another Ingersoll on the lecture platform." Certainly not, when his place is taken by men who occupy the pulpits of the land. Certainly not, while Theological Seminaries reek with the refuse of German rationalism. But what will the church do in the end thereof? The harvest of such sowing will not fully come in the generation of the sower. Teach-

ers whose habits of religion were formed under special evangelical influence may continue to practice the virtues of faith in spite of logical inconsistency, when students receiving from them their doctrinal bias will go on to the logical end of such teaching. And the radicalism of the students will become the standard of the masses. Phillips Brooks in his "Lectures on Preaching" observes: "There is nothing stranger than to watch how the intelligent speculations of the learned become the vague prejudices of the vulgar. You can shut up nothing within the scholar's study door. For good or for mischief all that the wise are thinking becomes in some form or other the basis upon which the ignorant live."

People will not care for the Bible if it is no more than a human book. As the New York Sun put it: "The Bishops and other clergy who are undertaking to reconcile the destruction of the infallibility of the Bible with the dogma and doctrine of their theology have entered upon an impossible task. They scuttle the ship, yet expect the crew to continue confident in its seaworthiness."

No wonder so many refuse to come aboard the ship, and the manning of the vessel is becoming problematical. A dearth of Protestant ministers in Germany, the home of higher criticism, is reported. The *Alte Glaube* of Leipzig, said to be the ablest of the orthodox church papers, thus speaks of the situation in that land:

"It is not many years since the graduates of the Protestant theological faculties were compelled to beg for positions in the state churches, and often these young men were forced to wait as long as a dozen years before they could receive an appointment. Now all this is changed. The congregations are begging for pastors and preachers, the theological auditoriums are deserted and empty benches are the rule. For this condition the radical theology is chiefly to blame. In recent years the radicals have gained the upper hand in practically every theological faculty. It is reliably reported that among all the theological teachers of Protestant Germany there is only one who believes in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. * * * * * * Everywhere do we find the fundamentals and essentials of the Christian religion denied—the Trinity, the

divinity of Christ, the work of atonement. The *religiousgeschichtliche* school, now in control, seeks to explain Christianity as the product of the religious factors and forces that prevailed in the Graeco-Roman and the Jewish world at the time of the New Testament, and thus to eliminate the idea of revelation. Professor Kruger, the church historian of Giessen, recently declared that it was the duty of the theological teacher to "endanger the souls" of his students. The fact of the matter is that he and his kind have made it impossible for earnest young men to study theology, for they are taught to deny and to reject the very truths on which the church is based and for which it must stand or fall. Many a young man has gone to the university earnest in the faith and anxious to serve the church, and has been shipwrecked by what he learned at the feet of savants in these institutions. It is a significant fact that the famous philanthropist, Pastor von Bodelschwingh, has established at Bielefeld a special school of theology for those candidates whose faith has been undermined in the universities. Modern radical theology, as enthroned at the universities, is the chief cause of the danger that is threaten-

ing the very existence of the church in the land of Luther."

This dearth is beginning to manifest itself in other Protestant countries. The result is inevitable where higher criticism is fostered by pulpit and seminary. Why should young men wish to enter the ministry, when they will have nothing but negations to preach? And why indeed can they be expected, under the circumstances, to show any interest in this calling?

The decline of church membership is the correlate of ministerial decline. As Prof. Sayce is reported to have said: "The higher criticism saves no souls." Churches infected with this unbelief may be social clubs, but their mission as soul savers is gone; and if a man is fortunate enough to hear an evangelist whose preaching and faith brings him to Christ, there is little help for his spiritual life in one of these churches. Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman says he received a letter from a minister who asked him to send them an evangelist, adding: "He must be an evangelist on the old line, believing in the inspiration of the Scriptures and the atonement of Christ. I am not able to accept these truths fully myself, and

therefore I am not a soul winner. Every man that has joined my church for five years has come under the influence of such an evangelist pastor as I now want you to send me." What a confession!

But the destruction of faith and loss of spiritual power are not the final consequences of this modern teaching. With the moral imperative supplied by an infallible Bible, gone, a reign of lawlessness ensues. How else account for the increase of crime and social disorder? A German student of these problems said: "Germany is now reaping the harvest of advanced thought: the prisons are full." And one of the eminent and devout statesmen of America, a justice of the Supreme Court of the U. S., addressing a company of preachers, said: "You ministers are making a fatal mistake in not holding forth before men as prominently as the previous generation did, the retributive justice of God. You are fallen into a sentimental style of rhapsodizing over the love of God and you are not appealing to that fear of future punishment which your Lord and Master made such a prominent element in His preaching. And we are seeing the effects

of it in the widespread demoralization of private virtue and corruption of the public conscience throughout the land."

To meet this situation the ministry and church, instead of casting off the devices of higher criticism and returning to the source of wisdom and power, keep adding wheels and cogs to the church machinery and work the social idea more strenuously. *Vain substitution!* Nothing but faith in a book that brings to us the final, authoritative word as to sin and redemption can clothe the church with the power of rebuke and conviction and fill men with the spirit of self-sacrifice. In the language of a French pastor who writes of why the ministry is insufficiently recruited: "Here is my conclusion. When one amuses oneself by clipping the wings of a bird, flight soon becomes impossible to it. Thanks to the discussion, to the negations which are everywhere peddled about, our christian wings have been cut. Give again to our young people, the families of our Evangelical Churches, the wings of a vital faith in the redeeming Lord, and then the holy enthusiasm for Him and His great cause will bring back the days of the past."

"Even if it were demonstrated to a certainty that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, that would not make the critical school a whit more ready to accept its statements. The course of New Testament criticism furnishes an illustration of what is possible in a case like this. Though the Gospels are proved to be of so early a date that the writers could have had knowledge of the things they profess to relate, the modern advanced critics of the New Testament do not feel themselves bound on that account to receive the books as historical. They have to make allowance for the bias of the writer even when the writer is a contemporary; and if he relates events which they consider cannot have occurred, his account is rejected as incredible."—Prof. James Robertson, D. D., *The Early Religion of Israel.*

"In no other sphere would men listen to what passes for proof when Scripture is assailed. In no other sphere would such trifling as this be tolerated. If only these men could be "got into court," and be subjected to cross-examination they would lose not only their case but their reputation!"—Sir Robert Anderson, K. C. B.,LL.D. (a learned Att'y at Law, London, England).

CHAPTER IX

THE ETHICAL PERVERSIONS OF HIGHER CRITICISM.

One of the deplorable accompaniments of higher criticism is the loss of the ethical sense. What else can account for the amazing belief that the forgery of a document, the appropriation of another man's name to float one's ideas, was perfectly allowable and in accord with divine principles of inspiration and teaching? The founders and leaders of this school of unbelief are consistent at least in their bold contention for this asserted practice of Biblical writers; for they deny there is any revelation or inspiration in the Scriptures, and they utterly reject miracles. Yet even apart from the question of revelation and inspiration no honest man would accept this view of getting one's writing before the public, or, in other words, call a forgery an honest piece of business. If he were a fool, incapable of making moral distinctions, he might call black white and good evil; in that case, however, the term honesty

as well as intelligence would be inapplicable, since reason and morality go together. We do not predicate honesty or dishonesty of brutes, idiots and babies. While, therefore, we may say the original framers and propagators of the forgery theory are consistent with their rejection of the traditional view that the Scriptures were supernaturally inspired, it is nevertheless impossible to harmonize that theory with sound ethics, for the reason that the writings forged are not represented or meant to be understood as fiction enforcing truth, but as the veritable work of the men whose names they bear. They were, in fact, on the theory stated, *intended to deceive* people. So one of the greatest of these original critics said, in reference to the inconsistency of accepting his hypothesis and claiming at the same time to believe in the supernatural origin of the Scriptures: "I have proved the Old Testament to be a fraud, but never dreamt as these Scotch fellows do, of making God a party to the fraud."

And here is the tragedy of this critical propaganda. It is when men professing to be evangelical, to believe in the Scriptures as divinely inspired and to respect the authority of Christ

and His apostles, accept and teach a theory destructive of these facts, that the perversion of the ethical sense is painfully apparent to all who believe that God is not the Author of sin and cannot be a party to fraud of any kind. It is another illustration of the fact to which history has borne witness so many times, that error blinds the judgment and reduces men to a state of moral obtuseness in which they are incapable of seeing things in their right relations.

This perversion of the conscience is seen in the declaration, which is repeated with much emphasis, that scholars agree as to the correctness of the Wellhausen theory, while facts to the contrary are concealed. It is false that scholars agree, as claimed, that there are none, competent to speak on this question, who hold the traditional view of the Bible. The fact is the critical hypothesis is rapidly falling into disrepute in countries where it once held sway and scholars are throwing off the incubus, while many of the ablest thinkers in other lands have never "bowed the knee to Baal." It is concealment of this fact, or unsupported assumption to the contrary, that makes the agents of this propaganda morally un-

sound and scripturally unsafe. A writer in the London *Churchman,* giving a summary of the "Recent Continental Criticism of the Higher Criticism" describes "the boycott of books and studies hostile to Wellhausenism which has left opinion in England and America so largely in the dark, as to the real situation abroad." An able German scholar, Möller, in the preface to his unanswerable work "Are the Critics Right?" declares that when he was himself a believer in the Wellhausen theory, students were urged not to read arguments against the theory, and that his return to sanity on this question was due to throwing off the yoke of subserviency to the higher critics and of becoming fair to their opponents. When he gave candid consideration to arguments for the conservative view, and pursued his studies along lines that opened to him, he became convinced of the correctness of this view. This case is cited to show the want of fairness in the teaching of higher criticism, and such a want betrays the loss or perversion of the ethical sense.

A still more lamentable illustration of this loss is the conduct of men who have accepted the conclusions of higher criticism and yet continue to enjoy the honors and emoluments of positions in churches whose doctrines they are pledged to maintain. From these positions of ease and comfort, they assault "the faith of our fathers" and seek to turn over the Church to the enemies of Revelation. If they were honest they would abandon the evangelical entrenchments and fight "in the open" against what they no longer believe. As the *Watchman* reports, the Bishops of Derby and Ossory in England have stated the matter clearly in answering some who protested against the dropping of a clergyman because he did not believe in the virgin birth of Jesus. They say it is not a matter of liberty but of honesty. "It is a transparent fallacy to confound liberty of thought with indifference to contract." A man who no longer receives the Scriptures at their face value, as the Church demands, but reduces them to a heap of fragments with their spiritual unity and supernatural authority destroyed, and who in this work of destruction sets aside the positive statements of the Lord Jesus Christ as

having no value whatever in weighing the conclusions above mentioned—such a man has no right to be in the evangelical camp. To tolerate him is treason to Christ. A church that harbors him has lost something more than its first love. Its conscience is gone! He who "holdeth the seven stars in His right hand and walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks," would never say to it, "I know thy works and thy toil and patience and that *thou canst not bear them who are evil and thou hast tried them who call themselves apostles and they are not, and hast found them liars.*"

In view of all the facts the words of Dr. Jay Benson Hamilton are none too strong:

"The issue is clearly drawn between the pseudo scholars who have betrayed their trust and the young ministers whom they have deceived, on the one side, and the teachers and workers in the Sunday schools and the average church members and the great body of the ministry upon the other. The latter instead of surrendering and consenting to the discrediting of the Book and the destruction of the Church have a much easier and simpler thing to do. Dismiss those who have

proven themselves untrue to their ordination vows and find new teachers who are pious enough to abstain from perjury. The young ministers will outgrow their child's disease of doubt and be saved to the Church if they are worth saving."

NOTE: My attention has been called to an article which appeared in the Expositor for December, 1913, by Professor Adam C. Welsh, on "The Present Position of Old Testament Criticism." In that article the following explanation is made of how the Wellhausen theory came to be so successful and so widely accepted:

"The Wellhausen theory was framed under the influence of certain dominant conceptions as to the origin and growth of religion which were then current. In part it owed its success to the simple fact that it thus fell in with the Zeitgeist. Evolution was in the air, and the theory seemed to apply evolution to the development of the Hebrew religion. But evolution with laws borrowed from the physical order is apt to blunder badly when it is applied to religion at all, and especially to blunder when it is applied to the Hebrew religion which gives so large a space to prophecy."

Let the reader reflect upon the following statements made by Professor Welsh, himself a critic, and observe how they confirm everything I have said about the arbitrary and unfair treatment of

the Scriptures by the critics. (The italics are mine.)

"The theory submitted the prophets to a scheme of evolution which had not been patient enough to learn the laws of development of religion from religion itself. As a result, certain elements in their teaching were *ignored,* other elements were *ruled out.*"

"The theory could find no room in its view of how religion develops from such a factor, and so, sometimes *with an uneasy conscience,* that factor in the Hebrew faith was *ignored.*"

"When the prophets declared, as they do with one voice, that they said these things in virtue of a deeper knowledge of God and His will, their testimony was *ignored.* They were either *deceiving themselves* or saying things which they *really did not quite mean.*"

"There were passages in the prophets in which these spoke of the day of the Lord, as implying an intervention direct and immediate to set up a new order in the world which was under their God's power. These also were *inconvenient to the theory.* . . . All such sayings which implied a relation between God and a world *must be late.* But the passages also offended *because men had formed the prophets in their own likeness.* Believing themselves in a long slow process, they believed that the prophets must have

held the same thing. That God should intervene directly meant a break in the chain of evolution."

"Hence the passages which implied a different view *were watered down or explained away.* . . . So there came to be common *a violent and often painfully arbitrary treatment of the text of the prophets.* They were cut to pieces and assigned to many dates."

"I think it is no exaggeration to say *that the result has been to cast a very strong suspicion, in calmer minds, on the worth of the whole critical movement.*"

And he adds that "through the later work of the Wellhausen school of criticism the distinctive character of the Hebrew religion seemed to be in danger of disappearing altogether."

Speaking of the reported decline in Church membership in England, Dr. Forsyth says that the real cause is the decay "in personal religion of a positive and experienced kind, and often in the pulpit;" and that "decay in membership of the Church is due to decay of membership in Christ. Even among those who remain in active membership of our Churches, the type of religion has changed, the sense of sin can hardly be appealed to by preachers now, and to preach grace is in many (even orthodox) quarters regarded as theological obsession, and the wrong language for the hour, while justification by faith is practically obsolete."—*The Cruciality of the Cross.*

Dr. Denney, perhaps the greatest theologian in Scotland, said at the memorable Edinburgh Missionary Conference, that the United Free Church had increased its membership only by one person for every two congregations in five years, and continued: "The number of candidates for the ministry is much smaller at the present time than it was a good many years ago; it is hardly a sufficient number to keep up the staff at home, to say nothing of supplying men abroad. Men are not coming forward as ministers, nor coming forward as missionaries, because they are not coming forward into the membership of the Church at all. Something must happen to the Church at home if it is going even to look at the work that has been put upon it by the Conference."

CHAPTER X

FRUIT OF HIGHER CRITICISM AND THE NEW THEOLOGY

The reader's attention has already been directed to the spiritual decline which follows the inculcation of advanced critical and theological views as proof of their falsity. The infinite author of truth will not put His seal upon error and continue to pour spiritual blessings upon churches that hold low views of inspiration and weaken the authority of the Holy Scriptures. It is becoming more and more evident, whatever denials are put forth by those interested in propagating the assumptions of higher criticism, that the propaganda is working spiritual death in Protestant Christendom. Loss of converting power and the failure to maintain a high type of Christian life in churches is excused or explained by changed conditions and the new emphasis upon the "social mission of the Church;" as if the Church had any mission apart from the salvation of men from their sins and their sanctification to the welfare of others! Sociology would be a poor

substitute for salvation and if the Church forfeits her spiritual power by leaving the main track for the sociological switch, what is there to distinguish her from a mere humanitarian society, occupied with the superficial aspects of life? It is well to pass helpful laws and to seek to better the environment of people, but unless deep, underlying causes are reached and the hearts of men are turned to God, old effects will reappear and the social problem remain to perplex alike Church and State. Social service must be the handmaid of the people's religion and not their religion itself. But the deplorable effect of stressing the social idea to the neglect of the deep spiritual necessities of men, is to create a false conception of the Gospel and to put the Church out of commission as a divine, soul-saving institution. And this insistence of the exponents of higher criticism upon the call of the Church to engage in social service, is but a veiled apology for the loss of supernatural, converting power in the Church and a virtual confession that the Holy Spirit will not honor their radical views concerning the Holy Scriptures.

The truth is, the only call which the Church has is to evangelize the world; to get men saved from sin and filled with the Spirit of God; for this involves and assures the exemplification of the Christ-life in devotement to human welfare. That the Church is not fully realizing this call is apparent from the decline of church membership that is reported in various places as well as from the decrease of vital piety among church members. The latest religious statistics from England show that the Baptist and Congregational churches have had a year of decline and that their membership and the children of their Sunday Schools are less by many thousands than a year ago. A similar condition exists in other Protestant bodies. Even worse is the situation reported from Germany, whence higher criticism has spread over the world. A German correspondent writes to the *Christian World* as follows:

"The number of university students attending divinity classes continues to dwindle rapidly. In several universities the number is less than half what it was twenty years ago, and in all the Protestant universities the shrinkage is so manifest

as to cause grave fears for the immediate future. The other day a South German journal declared that should this shrinkage continue at the same rate for another five years there will not be a solitary theological student left in any Protestant university in Germany. There are entire districts already where it is found next to impossible to find young men for ordination. Despite all our advance in art and in the so-called graces of civilization, our family life is becoming more raw and immature. The old affections which once characterized our race are rapidly disappearing, and instead we have parents who have no conception of their duty as moral guides, and children who resent all discipline, all parental control and who are taught by example to be self-indulgent and to follow pleasure and gain as the aim and object of life. Our homes, as moral and religious training centres, are disappearing."

This is the inevitable result of such treatment as the Bible has received at the hands of the critics. Low ethical views and loose conduct prevail when false theories concerning the Holy Scriptures spread from Church schools among the people. The fear of the Lord disappears with

reverence for His Word and the operation of the Holy Spirit ceases when the product of His inspiration is reduced to the level of mere human literature. Professor W. H. Griffith Thomas says that the well-known English writer, now Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, was walking with Wellhausen in the streets of Greifswald, and ventured to ask him whether, if his views were accepted, the Bible could retain its place in the estimation of the common people. "I cannot see how that is possible," was the sad reply.

Dr. Samuel J. Andrews says: "No building can long stand when the foundation is undermined; the first rude shock makes it fall. Many, indeed, may continue to profess great reverence for the Scriptures, as did the Jews of the Lord's day, and study them much, simply because they interpret in the spirit of the time, and find in them what they wish to find. And we have reason to believe that there are many who, like Mr. M. Arnold, sing the praises of the Bible long after it has ceased to have for them any authority, or any theological value."—*Christianity and Anti-Christianity in Their Final Conflict.*

Hence, the barrenness of a ministry pitched to that note. "The Word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword," but if something be substituted for it, there will be no conviction of sin and no real conversions. A paper on "Present Phases of Evangelism," was read by an orthodox minister before a Ministerial Association. In the discussion that followed, a prominent pastor said, in substance:

"In the theological seminary I espoused the higher criticism, and came out an ardent advocate of the New Theology. My ministry was barren; no souls were saved, and I found my church dying by inches on my hands. I discovered what the matter was: it was in my own preaching. The New Theology, for edifying and saving results, is not preachable. I confess to you that I have abandoned it and have gone back to the old-fashioned, conservative theology, and God is now blessing my ministry."

His was not the only testimony reported of that sort.

The evil has invaded mission lands and the Church that should be "terrible as an army with banners," as she confronts the heathen world,

finds herself discounted by the negations of higher criticism. A Moslem paper, the Review of Religions, said: "Thus has the Bible been swept away as a straw before the mighty current of modern criticism, and such was the fate it deserved. It is not the unmixed Word of God, it is not unerring. Such is the modern Christian faith, and we are glad to see that even the Christian missionaries have recognized the truth of those views."

Another Moslem, well acquainted with European thought, is represented by Professor Hartman, a German Statesman, long a resident in Mohammedan lands, as saying:

"Why should there be disseminated among us religious documents the genuineness of which is in part contested, the meaning of which is in very many instances uncertain, and which in general Church use are treated as purely human productions that, even as far as Christian countries are concerned, have merely the value of a historically evolved fact?"

A letter written by two Japanese Christians of many years standing, to a magazine in that

country, contains the following confession of the ripe fruit of higher criticism:

"A generation ago we were taught by the early missionaries to believe the Bible to be verbally inspired from Genesis to Revelation; we now hold it to be full of errors. We reject the greater part of Paul's teaching; we no longer believe in Virgin Birth or Everlasting Punishment for unbelievers, nor that God can forgive sins only through the mediation and suffering of Christ:—this, a mere Paulinism, is no longer tenable. Many who, 30 or 40 years ago, became Christians, have ceased to be Christians for these reasons, and there are more who have left the Church than now belong to it."

A missionary in Japan writes:

"My own observation is that the Catechist who accepts the results of higher criticism is of no use as an evangelist. He is sure of nothing, and only feebly exhorts people to get better and be better; he makes no converts. Osaka, Kyoto and Tokyo are the most deeply affected of any part of Japan by the higher criticism."

A desire to restate Christianity was evinced by the Japanese clergy and catechists at Kiuskiu in a

letter to the C. M. S. Missionary Conference there in 1907. The letter said:

"Up-to-date learning shows us that Evolution was the mode of origin of things, not Creation, and that the Bible is scientifically wrong and full of error. It added that Genesis was a myth, written long after the events occurred; the New Testament facts were discredited, miracles a mistake, and there was no real basis for many doctrines taught by the Church."

The C. M. S. Missionary Conference, held in Lower Bengal in 1906, reported that higher critical views had "begun to trouble the minds of Indian Christians. Among non-Christians also the advance of the Kingdom of Christ is likely to receive a serious shock if a suggestion comes with any authority from a Christian source that our Sacred Records are not true."

These examples could be augmented. The poison has been carried into every land. The native mind is quick to turn the assumptions of modern criticism against the missionary who stands by the Supernatural Book and the missionary who accepts the assumptions betrays his trust and confirms the heathen distrust of the Bible. Such is

the heavy handicap with which the Great Commission to evangelize the nations has been loaded by pretended Christian teachers of western lands. As stated by the late George Ensor, the first C. M. S. missionary to Japan:

"Christian people will never put themselves long about to preach and teach out of a discredited Bible. If the Bible be untrustworthy, we will not exert ourselves to send it to the Confucianist or to the Mohammedan. Both will logically affirm that, if our Bible be untrue, they don't care to exchange theirs for ours. If our teachings be subject to a Bible test for its truth, and the test itself has proved unreliable, we find ourselves before the Confucianist and the Mohammedan in the most illogical, the most hopeless and the most helpless plight."

Well says the Rev. Dr. W. St. Clair Tisdall, from whose article on "The Bearing of the Destructive Criticism of the Bible on Missionary Work," these citations are made: "We cannot expect true Christians—the only people who ever have supported Christian missionary work—to deny themselves in order to give money to propagate ideas which are contrary to the teachings

of the Bible, and are dishonoring to the Lord Jesus Christ, and are ineffective for men's salvation."

Whether at home or abroad higher criticism is the foe to evangelism, the paralysis of Christian faith, and the damnation of lost men. "Every plant," said our Lord, "which My heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." We know, therefore, the doom that awaits this strange plant transplanted by the enemies of revelation into the visible Church and now assiduously cultivated by men who wear the livery of orthodoxy while they scatter its poisonous fruit.

"There is a most shallow view, constantly propounded now-a-days, when people say that they would rather listen to what Christ says in the Gospels than to what is written in the Epistles of the Apostles. The Holy Ghost alone could bring to the remembrance of the Apostles all things that Christ had spoken; . . . Christ told them everything in germ, although in Jerusalem, and afterwards all was more fully revealed."

"When Jesus appeared to him, then Saul of Tarsus not merely saw Jesus, but he saw also Moses. He understood then what was the real glory of Moses—to lead us to the Saviour. . . . It was the sign of a sincere Israelite who loved the law of Moses, that being convinced of his guilt and of the weakness of the flesh, he longed after the Messiah, and after the promise of the Father, the Holy Ghost; and it is a sign of our sincerity, who profess to have received Jesus and the Holy Ghost, that we delight ourselves in the law, and that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."—Adolph Saphir, *The Divine Unity of Scripture,* pp. 113, 303.

CHAPTER XI

"BACK TO CHRIST"

Nothing is easier than to repeat some sentiment whose form of expression has come to be regarded as a criterion of truth, and yet nothing may more completely befog the truth and blind men to the reality it is intended to disclose. The most striking watchword may become the superficial cry of those who seek to escape the responsibility imposed by unwelcome truth. Sometimes, as in the instance of the new theological demand, "back to Christ," the wish to maintain opinions or justify actions in conflict with apostolic interpretation of Christianity, gives birth to the cry.

It would be well for those who assume this position to reflect on the logical bearing of the position on the authority of Christ. He declared, "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my word shall not pass away." "Back to Christ," therefore, involves the obligation to abide by whatever He said concerning Himself, the accuracy of the Scriptures, and the inspiration of the Apostles.

What he affirmed in regard to the authorship of certain writings, must be received by all who repair to Him for counsel, the modern scholar to the contrary notwithstanding. When, to give another example, he proclaims that his Second coming is literal and personal, the critic who says "back to Christ" and then proceeds to reduce this proclamation to a figure of speech and to spiritualize everything, or to deny that He has said it, evidences his lack of consistency or his aversion to the truth.

Once more: When Christ taught that the Apostles as His witnesses would be exempt from error by the Spirit of truth, we are bound to accept their interpretation of His teaching and their exposition of the principles of His religion. He declared that they should be "guided into all truth." Therefore, the Epistles are as much inspired as the Gospels, and the theology of Paul is the theology of Christ. The going away of Christ was for the instalment of the apostles in His place to give the Church and the world an inspired and authoritative explanation of the principles He taught and died to establish. He declared the moral necessity for this in such state-

ments as these: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I not go away, the Comforter will not come unto you." "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak from Himself, but what things soever He shall hear, these shall He speak, and He shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me; for He shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you." He spoke of the purpose of His advent into the world and of His death. His Apostles have given the true meaning of that death. Hence, while the Gospels contain the facts of His life and death, the Epistles give us the divine explanation of those facts. He enunciated principles; they explained and applied those principles. To talk of accepting the teaching of Christ, while rejecting that of the Apostles is as though one said I believe in the principles of Christianity but not in their meaning. This is not to get back to Christ; it is to get away from Him.

The chief point of attack is the Pauline theology, especially the doctrines of sin and atone-

ment. The cry of "Back to Christ" is merely the method of evincing hostility to those doctrines and the revolt of natural heart against God. It is one with rejecting the deity of Christ.

These fundamentals stand or fall together, and since it was given to Paul to make this fact clear, he is the object of bitterest critical assault.

As to the result of such ill-balanced study of the New Testament, I cannot do better than quote the words of Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall regarding the insistence upon the first three Gospels alone rather than including the Epistles as well, and dwelling upon the historical Christ to the exclusion of the Redeemer. He says:

"The effects of this are already appearing in the impoverished religious values of the sermons produced by the younger generation of preachers, and the deplorable decline of spiritual life and knowledge in many churches. Results open to observation show that the movement to simplify the Christian essence by discarding the theology of St. Paul easily carries the teaching of the Christian pulpit to a position where, for those who submit to that teaching, the characteristic experiences of the Christian life become practi-

cally impossible. The Christian sense of sin; Christian penitence at the foot of the cross; Christian faith in an atoning Saviour; Christian peace with God through the mediation of Jesus Christ; —these and other experiences, which were the very life of apostles and of apostolic souls, fade from the view of the ministry, have no meaning for the younger generation."

To this forcible statement I should like to add the language of Dr. J. H. Jowett, discussing Paul's conception of the Lord Jesus Christ:

"My brethren, the Jesus of the new theology is a Jesus I can admire, is a Jesus I can respect; a Jesus in whose presence I can take off my hat. But He is *not* a Jesus before whom I can go on my knees and worship. The Jesus of the new theology is the last link of that chain, and not the first. He is empty and impoverished of divinity, and I cannot kneel in His presence and say, 'My Lord and My God.'"

"So far as I can see the arguments used in the one field, of the critical treatment of the Old Testament may be employed equally well in the other (the New Testament), and the Gospel history be critically reconstructed out of the tendencies and views of the second century, just as the account of the pre-prophetic religion given by the Hebrew writers is made the result of the projection backward of later ideas."—Prof. James Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel.*

"It does not appear possible to account for the rise and course of apostolic Christianity except by the recognition of the supernatural facts and forces to which the books themselves testify. The frank acknowledgment of the supernatural, together with the perception of the no less truly genetic way in which the original faith in Jesus as Messiah was unfolded and extended, would seem to be required of the historian who wishes to be faithful to his sources of information and to present apostolic Christianity as it was."—Dr. Purves.

"The great bulk of the opposition to the virgin birth comes from those who do not recognize a supernatural element in Christ's life at all."—Professor Orr.

CHAPTER XII

DARKENING COUNSEL BY WORDS WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE

"Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" Lyman Abbott, editor of the Outlook, whose theological vagaries and fallacious reasoning concerning the Scriptures make it unwise and unsafe to commend his publication. An example of Dr. Abbott's shallow unbelief is the editorial on the action of the New York Presbytery in licensing to preach four young men who admitted they could not credit "the Virgin Birth of Jesus Christ."

Referring to that action, the *Outlook* says (italic type ours): "We hope that this may be taken to indicate a tendency in the Church *not to attach a greater importance to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth than the Bible attaches to it.*" It indicates a tendency, no doubt; signs of it are appearing here and there; but to speak of "not attaching greater importance to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth than the Bible attaches to it,"

is a covert assault on the integrity of the Scripture narratives as is evident by a further reference to the Virgin Birth as *"a disputed event in remote history."*

Here, then, is the animus of the Outlook's editorial—a denial that the record of this event is trustworthy, though two of the Gospels contain it and there is no more reason to doubt it than other things which the Gospels set forth as the evidences and credentials of the unique character and claims of Jesus Christ. The mystery of this incarnate personality is an offence to the carnal reason and must be got rid of by attacking the trustworthiness of Bible history. And this is the process by which higher criticism has unitarianized the Scriptures and given us, instead of deity incarnate, a sort of "divinity" that is "common to all men." Well may it be said, "They have taken away my Lord."

The Outlook continues: "To license a theological student is to declare that he is fitted to be a preacher of the Gospel. It is certain that a man may be fitted to be a preacher of the Gospel who never refers in his sermons to the Virgin Birth. The Apostles were great preachers and they

never referred to the Virgin Birth. Jesus Christ is the ideal preacher of Christian history, and He never referred to the Virgin Birth. We wonder how many who read this article ever heard any preacher refer in his sermons to the Virgin Birth.

"It is clearly not necessary to preach on the Virgin Birth in order to preach effectively."

As a specimen of irrelevant and superficial reasoning we do not remember ever to have seen this equaled. Christ and His apostles never referred in their preaching to the Virgin Birth; therefore a man who denies this event may be fit to preach the Gospel! No! If Christ never referred to this mystery, the reverent mind would accept the omission as one of those silences for which no explanation was vouchsafed. We may, however, affirm that He would not speak of it to His enemies, who would only mock at such a revelation. See for reason Matt. 7:6. Holy mysteries were not for unbelievers. May not this also answer the question why did not the apostles speak of it in their preaching, if indeed they never did so? "I have many things to say unto you," said Jesus, even to His disciples, before the Spirit came, "but ye cannot bear them now." The Pharisees re-

jected His claim to equality, with God, because they believed him to be the natural son of Joseph. Compare Matthew 13:54-55 with John 5:17-18 and John 10:33. He, however, never disavowed the understanding they had of His statements concerning His relation to the infinite Father, but went on to vindicate His claim to equal honors with God. The Gospel of John was written for the Church to confirm faith in the Deity of Christ. So clear is this that critics have tried hard to discredit its historical character. But it stands an irrefutable witness to the Godhead of Christ.

How does Dr. Abbott know that the apostles never referred to this doctrine in their preaching, seeing he lives nineteen hundred years after them? Their writings prove that they believed and taught it. No other interpretation can be put upon John's declaration that the eternal Word became flesh and tabernacled among men, and upon his polemic against the Gnostics who denied the incarnation of Deity in Jesus Christ. See 1 John 1:1-2, 4:1-3 and 5:20; also 2 John 9-11; which must be considered with the Gospel of John. So with the Pauline writings which contain allusions to the Virgin Birth, since by this

happening alone can content be put into his doctrine of the incarnation. Rom. 9:5; Phil. 2:5-8; 1 Tim. 3:16; Titus 2:10, 13.

"As regards the writings of St. Paul," says Prof. Henry Cowan of Aberdeen, Scotland, "if his silence as to the virgin birth be an argument against the credibility, we must reject all the records of Christ healing disease; for not one cure is referred to in any Pauline letter. The nature of St. Paul's epistles did not demand any express reference to the Virgin Birth. His teaching is based mainly on our Lord's death and resurrection. Still, as in the case of St. John, there is a latent hint of a superhuman entrance into the world."

And Dr. Weiss, the famous Berlin professor, holds that a new creative act of God, a cancelling of the natural continuity is "an almost indispensable consequence of St. Paul's theology."—(Bibl. Theologie des N. T.)

The writings of the Apostles imply a strong probability that in their oral ministry they referred to the mystery of the incarnation. But if they did not do so, their writings prove their faith in the mystery and it is faith that makes the true

preacher. Big preachers may deny the atonement as some do, but they are not "effective preachers." The *effective* preacher is he who preaches the Gospel "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven" and the Holy Ghost will never attend a ministry that doubts or denies a doctrine and a fact plainly revealed in the Scriptures and vital to the atonement. It is wide of the mark to say, it is not necessary to preach on the Virgin Birth to preach effectively. It is the *want of faith* in this truth that evinces unfitness to preach and precludes the manifestation of the Holy Spirit who alone is the guarantee of spiritual results. Moreover, so long as reverent faith exists in this doctrine, there is no need to refer to it specifically, if the atonement made possible by the fact be faithfully preached. But let it be called in question and men of faith will emphasize it, as did the apostles when it was attacked by the Gnostics.

Again: "A recent writer has pointed out the undoubted fact that the Virgin Birth is not the cause of Christ's divinity. It is only an evidence for His divinity. One may believe in the divinity and not believe in that special evidence.

"The divinity of Christ is a spiritual truth. It does not depend upon a physiological fact."

These are astonishing statements and reveal a pitiable blindness to the merits of the case. If Dr. Abbott means by "divinity" something more than a divine *humanity,* which the new theology affirms of all men, the physiological fact is essential to its manifestation in the world and its availability for the redemption of the world. How is it possible to believe in the divinity (Deity) of Christ as portrayed in the New Testament and reject the very means by which that Deity became a *manifested* fact on earth? "One may believe in the divinity and not believe in that special evidence"!! This is nonsense, if it refer to the Christ that "came into the world to save sinners." We recognize no other *Divinity* than that which was corporealized and dwelt among men, who "beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

Finally: "Jesus Christ has Himself pointed out the twofold evidence on which He would have His Church base its faith in His divinity: 'Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father

in me; or else believe me for the very work's sake.'

"The first evidence for his divinity is his character.

"The second evidence is the history of Christianity—that is, the history of what has been his influence on the life of the world.

"Whenever the Church substitutes for this twofold argument, based on a disputed event in remote history, it weakens the faith it wishes to establish."

We can only add to what has already been said that the twofold evidence adduced implies and necessitates the Virgin Birth. No such character and no such influence is possible on the *natural generation* theory.

Says Professor Orr: "Can we, in the establishing of such a new creative beginning—in the origination of One who, while holding of humanity is yet outside the chain of its heredities and liabilities—think of a spiritual miracle which has not also its physical side? I contend that we cannot. . . . In no case in the world's history has natural generation issued in a being who is sinless, not to say superhuman. But here in

Jesus is One who, as we have seen, is not only sinless and archetypal, but has in Him all the potencies of Godhead. Is it not reasonable to expect that His manner of entering the world will be also different from that of others?"—(The Virgin Birth of Christ.)

As the offspring of sinful man, Jesus would have been nothing more than a human teacher with the frailties and imperfections of other men. The world would still be despairing of a *Deliverer.* The only attempt to evade this reasoning is by denying that man is a fallen being and, in accordance with a universal law, produces after his kind. Of course this sweeps away the entire doctrinal system of the New Testament, whose teaching concerning sin, incarnation and redemption is a consistent whole. The denial of one point carries with it all, including the integrity of the record containing the "disputed event" which Lyman Abbott thinks is an element of weakness in the argument for Christ's divinity. But if the record cannot be relied upon, there is nothing to argue about. We have no more ground to dispute the Virgin Birth than we have to dispute the miraculous character and influence that de-

pend upon it—than we have to question other conceded facts that appear in the same narratives. To do so is to put the Scriptures out of court as a competent witness to anything. The extraordinary nature of an event does not vitiate the narrative. If Matthew and Luke are unreliable in this respect, they cannot be trusted to furnish us a truthful account at all. Thus every man who goes by his own judgment as to what is or is not credible makes his own Bible and we have no authoritative revelation from God.

John Stuart Blackie, in his *Homer and The Iliad* (referring to Wolf's theory concerning the writings of Homer which is identical with the critical theory concerning the Old Testament) says: "We who stand on the received text have the tradition of long centuries in our favor, and not one substantial reason against us. Possession in literary as in civil affairs is nine points of the law; and he who wishes to shake an old received document out of its consistency, must be prepared to bring something more weighty to bear against it than clever guesses and well-devised possibilities."

Divine inspiration guaranteed the accuracy of the record of events essential to an under-

standing of the truth. These writers got their information first-hand. Luke's reason for writing his Gospel makes the editor of the Outlook an object of pity. "Forasmuch," he begins, "as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning *those matters which have been fulfilled among us, even as they delivered them unto us which from the beginning were eye witnesses and ministers of the word,* it seemed good to me also, *having traced the course of all things accurately from the first,* to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, *that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed.*" Among the things which were a matter of *instruction* and narrated by Luke as a *certainty,* was the *Virgin Birth.* Dr. Abbott terms it "a disputed event." We stand by *Luke.*

Now how came Luke into possession of the facts? Sir William M. Ramsay thinks they "came ultimately to Luke's knowledge in some way which he does not explain precisely; but he suggests in his own fashion that Mary was ultimately his authority. He knew what was kept hid in her heart;" and that "the knowledge came

to him from her either directly or through a trustworthy intermediary."

This is likewise the opinion of Prof. William Sanday (Oxford), who says: "It is not too much to say that the whole story is told from the point of view of a woman, and more particularly of Mary. Impressions of this kind cannot perhaps be insisted upon; but for myself I believe that the last link in the chain by which the substance of the chapters reached St. Luke—and I should not be surprised if the first link too—was a woman."

Prof. Theod. Zahn, D. D., Erlangen, Germany, whose confession is: "My faith in Jesus as my Redeemer stands and falls with the grateful recognition of the facts which form the contents of the Gospel," affirms that John has "not only indirectly shown his familiarity with the Virgin Birth of Jesus and omitted any opposition to it, but he has confessed it with full sounding testimony. If the Fourth Evangelist is the disciple who, in compliance with the last will of the dying Jesus, took Mary into his house, we cannot imagine any stronger testimony than this; for, what men can know of the birth of Jesus, that was known to the mother who has borne our Lord."

NOTE: Prof. James Orr sums up his arguments in the able work already mentioned, in the following propositions:

"1. The only two narratives we have of the birth of Jesus tell us that He was born of a Virgin.

2. The Gospels containing these narratives are genuine documents of the Apostolic Age.

3. The texts of these narratives have come down to us in their integrity.

4. The two narratives of the Virgin Birth are independent.

5. The narratives, nevertheless, are not contradictory, but are complementary and corroborative of each other.

6. There are strongest reasons for believing that Matthew's narrative comes from the circle of Joseph, and Luke's from the circle of Mary.

7. The Gospel of Mark, which embraces only the public ministry of Jesus, does not contradict the other narratives.

8. The Gospel of John does not contradict the other narratives, but presupposes them.

9. John unquestionably knew the earlier Gospels, and is traditionally identified with opposition to the earliest known impugner of the Virgin Birth, Cerinthus.

10. Paul does not contradict the Virgin birth. On the contrary, Luke, a chief witness of the Virgin Birth, was the companion of Paul, and Paul's language seems to presuppose some knowledge of the fact.

11. The doctrine of Paul and John—as of the New Testament generally—implies a miracle in the origin of Christ.

12. The Gospels containing the narratives of Christ's birth were, so far as known, received without question by the Church from their first appearance.

13. With the exceptions of the Ebionites—the narrowest section of the Jewish Christians—and some of the Gnostic sects, the Church from Apostolic times universally accepted the fact of the

Virgin Birth. The Nazarenes, or main body of the Jewish Christians, accepted it.

14. The early Church set high value on the Virgin Birth doctrinally, as attesting (1) the true humanity of Christ, and (2) His superhuman dignity.

15. The prophecy of Isaiah 7:14 is rightly applied by Matthew to the birth of Jesus.

16. Yet, as most critics now admit, this prophecy was applied by no one in those days to the Messiah, and therefore could not have suggested the invention of this story.

17. It is granted by a majority of recent critics that the myth—as they call it—of the Virgin Birth could not have originated on Jewish soil.

18. It is conclusively shown by Harnack and others that it could not have originated on Gentile soil.

19. Pagan myths do not afford any proper analogies to the Virgin Birth of Christ, or the doctrine of the Incarnation.

20. The perfect sinlessness of Christ, and the archetypal character of His humanity, imply a miracle in His origin.

21. The doctrine of the Incarnation of the pre-existent Son implies a miracle in Christ's origin.

22. The miracle in Christ's origin had of necessity a physical as well as a spiritual side.

23. The Virgin Birth answers historically to the conditions which faith postulates for the origin of Christ.

In light of these propositions, I cannot acquiesce in the opinion that the article of the Virgin Birth is one doctrinally indifferent, or that can be legitimately dropped from the public creed of the Church. The rejection of this article would, in my judgment, be a mutilation of Scripture, a contradiction of the continuous testimony of the Church from Apostolic times, a weakening of the doctrine of the Incarnation, and a practical surrender of the Christian position into the

hands of the advocates of a non-miraculous, purely humanitarian Christ—all on insufficient grounds."

"In proportion as unbelief in the Scriptures increases, the Person of the Incarnate Son, who, as the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End, alone gives it Unity, unity and meaning, recedes from our sight; and as He recedes, darkness deepens over both present and future. For years the most unobservant has seen how within the Church the study of prophecy has been greatly disparaged—a sure sign of that decay of faith which, beginning here, extends itself to history and doctrine, and ends in their final rejection."—Samuel J. Andrews, *Christianity and Anti-Christianity in Their Final Conflict.*

"The connection is so close that few who earnestly believe in the absolute worth of Christ's Person will be disposed to deny the truth of the Evangelical narratives relating to the manner of His entrance into, and exit from, the world."—Prof. A. B. Bruce, *Miraculous Elements in The Gospels.*

CHAPTER XIII

A DISPARAGED CHRIST: HIS PERSON

A gentleman once purchased a map of the U. S. in the form of blocks and having taken it home, gave the blocks to his children to put together. None of them succeeded until it was discovered there was a man in the map. When the figure of the man was made, the map was perfect. Such is the map of Revelation, known as the Bible. Though consisting of many parts, it is yet a complete whole. The key to its construction is the heavenly Man called by Himself the Son of Man, by His ablest Apostle "the Lord from heaven." Any attempt to reconstruct this celestial map without respect to Him must result in confusion. He is its principle of unity, its secret of power.

Many with no spiritual insight have taken it to pieces and subjected each piece to a microscopic examination, but since they did not see the Supernatural Man, their effort to put the parts together has met with no better success than the colored

deacon said his preacher attained: "He's de bes' in de world to take de Bible apart, but he don' know how to put it togeder again."

The higher critics and all others who handle the Word of God in a cold, unsympathetic spirit are colossal bunglers. When they are through with it, there is nothing but meaningless patchwork. They are not *scientific;* for true science does not *manufacture* facts but *discovers* them. These men are not looking for facts but for confirmation to a preconceived theory. Besides, facts are nothing to a man without eyes. As Chesterton says: "The higher critic finds, like Peeping Tom, that it is no good to have bored the hole when you have lost the eye." We cannot accept the word of blind men touching the facts of inspiration, and we are not shut up to their speculations for knowledge of the truth. The question of a Revelation is not left to them. This is a question which can be settled only by those who hold the key to the Scriptures. And the key is not furnished by any advocate of a false doctrine of Christ.

It is not going too far to say the Bible is inexplicable except upon a true Christology. Every

phase of Biblical teaching responds to the true view of Christ and takes its place in a harmonious, rational system of Christian thought. Any doctrine, cult, or criticism that does not accord Him the honor which the Scriptures demand, is an infinite disparagement of His claims and a denial of humanity's hope. A disparaged Christ means a fallible book, an unredeemed world, and a hopeless eternity. As Sir Robert Anderson, the learned lawyer of London, England, says, in his "remarkable book," *The Bible and Modern Criticism*: "It is not the Bible that is at stake but the Christ of the Bible." Therefore, when the Bible as inspired and authoritative goes out of the faith of the Church, Christ as "the Power of God and the Wisdom of God" goes with it. It is a vain imagination to think, under these circumstances, that the value of the Bible is enhanced and the dignity of Christ is maintained. We believe with the able author just quoted that "The foundation truth of Christianity is that the Man of Calvary is now sitting upon the throne of God," and we justify his statement, in his appeal to all fair minds, "that those who believe this upon no better authority than the higher critics' Bible are credu-

lous and superstitious. We can reach the Living Word only through the written word. Therefore in contending for a *really inspired*—an absolutely authoritative—Bible, we can say with Athanasius, 'We are fighting for our all.' "

Now, in four principal ways the Christ of the Bible is disparaged, the prevalence of which would be the tragedy of the world:

1. When His person is compromised, as by Gnosticism and Arianism in the Ancient Church, and by Socinianism or Unitarianism in the modern Church.

2. When His atonement is denied, as by theories which reject the expiatory character of His death and make salvation to consist in the following of an example.

3. When His power is limited, as by teaching that confines faith to the *Pardon* aspect of Christianity and is blind to the supreme purpose of Christ's mission to make men *holy*.

4. When His authority is disputed, as by Criticism that holds He spoke in the language of His age and therefore His word is not final touching the Holy Scriptures.

Gnosticism asserting the evil of matter taught that Jesus Christ was not the incarnation of God. Its leading exponent was contemporary with the apostle John who directed his writings against this heresy, declaring that whoever denied the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh was anti-Christ. A recrudescence of this error has appeared in Christian Science (so-called), its founder affirming the impossibility of Deity becoming corporealized. This cult, however, goes beyond Gnosticism which never denied the reality of matter. It contains elements of absurdity unknown to that ancient heresy. They are alike in sweeping away the doctrine of the incarnation which the Gospel and Epistles of John explicitly teach.

Arianism exalted Christ to the highest point of creature greatness, but left him nevertheless a creature. At one time it seemed likely to become the prevailing form of Christianity, but championed by Athanasius, "against the world," the truth of our Lord's divine-human personality became the creed of the Church.

Socinianism at first held more honorable views of Christ's person than the later forms of this

heresy. In its present day form of Unitarianism and higher criticism it gives us a Christ below the capacity of the men who have swept the supernatural out of the Bible. Its *Kenosis* "betokens not the humiliation of Christ, but His degradation. It is not that He became man, but that He sank to the level of a Jew of that age. Not that while 'knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands and that He was come from God and was going to God,' He humbled Himself; but that knowing nothing more than His contemporaries, His mind was warped by prejudice and ignorance."

The disastrous effect of such teaching is incalculable. Already the decline of spirituality portends the loss of all that evinces the supernatural character of Christianity. It is as Leonce de Grandmaison, editor of *Etudes,* and *Researches de Science Religieuse,* Paris, says in an able article on the *Witness of the Spirit* to the Deity of Christ.

"All yielding, every kind of Arianism, every attempt to reduce the Person of Christ to a subordinate role, eminent, if you will, but after

all within the human sphere—all yielding of this kind has been translated into a spiritual lowering, into a patent diminution of religious life."

"It is common to regard love as the fundamental feature of the divine character; and in this way it is very difficult to reach the attribute of justice. Most thinkers, indeed, do not reach it at all. This one fact should serve to show the error in which they are entangled. *Holy, holy, holy,* say the creatures nearest to God, when celebrating His perfection (Isa. VI), and not *good, good, good.* Holiness, such is the essence of God; and holiness is the absolute love of the good, and the absolute horror of evil. . . . It is obvious that justice is included no less necessarily than love itself in the fundamental feature of the divine character, holiness."—Godet.

"The wrath which pours out upon Him is not meant for Him as the righteous One who voluntarily offers Himself; but indirectly it relates to Him, so far as He has vicariously identified Himself with sinners, who are deserving of wrath. How could He have made expiation for sin, if He had simply subjected Himself to its cosmical effects, and not directly subjected Himself to that wrath which is the invariable divine correlative of human sin?"—Delitzsch.

CHAPTER XIV

A DISPARAGED CHRIST: HIS ATONEMENT

The connection of the truth discussed in the previous chapter with the nature of the atonement is too close to escape the attention of any thinker. A denial of our Lord's deity reduces His death to the level of martyrdom for an opinion, with no high and lasting significance for the race. When, after His resurrection, He opened the mind of the disciples that they might understand the Scriptures, and said to them, "Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day, and *that repentance and remission of sin should be preached in His name, unto all the nations,* beginning from Jerusalem," He proclaimed that His death and resurrection possessed elements of universality and moral deliverance utterly inconsistent with the idea of social and political martyrdom, evincing the unique, unparalleled character of this event. This view is further shown by His declaration: "Therefore doth the Father love me

because *I lay down my life,* that I may take it again. *No man taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself.* I have the power (Greek, *authority*) to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my father" (John 10:17-18); a statement whose bearing is evident from the incident recorded in John 18:4-8. What made them go backward and fall to the ground? Our Lord there demonstrated the meaning of His own words, "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." They could not take Him without His consent, nor would He give this until the safety of His chosen was assured. Then with the question "The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" (identical with "this commandment received I from my Father," John 10:18), He permitted his enemies to seize and bind Him.

Now, no martyr, in the common acceptation of the term, was ever able to say: "No man taketh my life from me but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." For though willing to die, he had no power to prevent his death. Because of his help-

lessness, his life was taken away by men. And death thenceforth held dominion over him. The fact that this was not so with Jesus invested His death with a meaning not possible on the theory of a merely human Christ.

The positive affirmations of Scripture must fix that meaning. A few passages will suffice in this connection.

"For this is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto the remission of sins." (Matt. 26:28.)

"Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith by his blood, to show His righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the shewing, I say, of His righteousness at this present season; that He might Himself be just and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." (Rom. 3:23-27.)

"God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, . . . Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf that we might become the

righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. 5:19-21, R. V.)

"Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." (Heb. 9:22.)

"Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous that He might bring us to God." (1 Pet. 3:18.)

"The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1:7.)

"Unto Him that loveth us and loosed us from our sins by His blood." (Rev. 1:5.)

A true exegesis of these Scriptures can yield but one interpretation. The death of Jesus Christ was an expiation for sin, not a martyrdom for principle. As such it was vicarious, since He had no sin to atone for. But the terrible nature of His sufferings proved the awful reality of sin which had disturbed the moral order of the universe, affronted the majesty and holiness of God and corrupted and separated the sinning creature from the Creator. Yet God would save "rebellious man." This He could do only by a plan that would combine the attributes of mercy and justice; that would wipe out infinite wrong and at the same time secure the bestowal of infinite

mercy. Such a plan, in short, to effect man's moral recovery, must safeguard the righteousness of God, for that is the foundation of His throne. Superficial thinkers see nothing in this. But the introduction of sin by the revolt of moral beings meant the profoundest problem in the universe. Love alone could not solve it; for love apart from righteousness becomes unprincipled. Repentance was not the way out; for this could neither repair the damage done by wrong nor create a love of right. Forgiveness as a sovereign act, without some provision for the vindication of righteousness and the moral restoration of the sinner, would be equivalent to licensing sin.

"Once we put law and necessity out of the relations between Christ's death and our sin, we dismiss the very possibility of thinking on the subject; we may use words about it, but they are words without meaning . . . . The simplest hearer feels that there is something irrational in saying that the death of Christ is a great proof of love to the sinful unless there is shown at the same time a rational connection between that death and the responsibilities which sin involves and from which that death delivers." "For love

in the Atonement is inseparable from law." (Denney.)

The incarnation and suffering of God in Jesus Christ solved the problem. This provided a perfect righteousness by which grace might have a free hand to rescue sinful man. Love inspired the atonement (John 3:16), but could not save without it (Rom. 3:24-26). Infinite wisdom alone was equal to the exigency—wisdom pervaded with love and girded by power. Thus the cross of Christ is "the power of God and the wisdom of God." And thus it comes that "grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 5:21.)

No finite being could have atoned for sin by rendering the homage which infinite righteousness demanded as the ground for the exercise of the pardoning prerogative. The sufferings of a man though he were a perfect man, might have had a finite value and served as an example, but they could never have satisfied the infinite factors of this problem. The wrath of God against sin cannot be dismissed as a fiction of theology. "It is usually because we are not angry enough with our own sin that we deny the anger of God." (H.

R. Mackintosh, D. D., New College, Edinburgh.) There is in every man whose conscience has not been perverted by false teaching a feeling that cannot be satisfied by any theory that ignores the question of Justice in relation to Sin. The able thinker just quoted speaks of "situations, terribly and inexorably real"—situations in which "the consciousness of sin is awake and urgent"—when "the Christian who has nothing to say about vicarious atonement, must acknowledge himself baffled, helpless and dumb." In support of this statement he refers to a conversation which Hugh Falconer had on this subject many years ago with the late Professor Pfleiderer, of Berlin. "He asked me," says Falconer, "to give him an actual instance. I mentioned that a few weeks before our talk a message came to the Manse begging me to come at once to a dying quarryman. The poor fellow was absolutely illiterate. He fastened his hungry eyes on me. What about God whom he must meet in a few hours? I spoke of God's love: in vain. I spoke of His Fatherhood: in vain. Love, compassion, mercy, Fatherhood were too vague. It was like catching at a glittering vapour. Some

instinct of Justice within him refused to be satisfied. So I said, 'God made us and loves us. But we have broken His law and are hopelessly in His debt. But He Himself has 'paid our debts.' His Christ died for us. There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Him.' I gave a rough illustration as a sort of window into a vicarious text. Could not the hungry eyes look through it and catch a glimpse of God Himself? They did see through it. "Our debts were paid." He could meet God in Christ his substitute. I put it to my friend. Was there not something honorable in that poor dying quarryman refusing the love till his conscience was satisfied? I can never forget Pfleiderer's emotion as he replied in effect: If a doctrine really meets a deep human need it must be true." (*The Heart of the Gospel and the Preacher,* "The Constructive Quarterly.")

A Christianity without a Divine Savior—in other words, a Christianity without the atonement and the regenerating Spirit—is a counterfeit, utterly inadequate to renew the soul and transform the life. On one occasion, Dr. Parker, the eminent London preacher, referring to the Unitarian conception of Jesus as a great example

only, used this illustration: "We have been to hear Paderewski play. It was wonderful, superb, magnificent. Then we went home and looked at the piano. We would have sold it to the first man who would have been fool enough to buy it. That is the effect of your great example upon me. I want not only a great Example, but a great Saviour, One who can deliver me from my weakness and my sin."

That hits the situation exactly. To say nothing of the impossibility of an example, however glorious, correcting the sinful past, such a theory cannot put heart into a man who feels the want of enabling power. A high example may bring despair to an earnest soul.

Now it is because "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," that His love can be trusted. We have not a God who is indifferent to sin but who has dealt with it in a manner to manifest His righteousness and commend His love. According to the *Unitarian* view there was no Divine sufferer, no expiation for sin, no manifestation of a holy and righteous love. This is a degradation of the character of God and a lowering of the Biblical conception of Christ. Is it any

wonder some pulpits are powerless? Forsyth has touched the secret of this weakness in the following forceful utterance: "The grace of God cannot return to our preachers or to our faith, till we recover what has almost clean gone from our general, familiar, and current religion, what liberalism has quite lost—I mean a due sense of the holiness of God. This holiness of God is the real foundation—it is certainly the ruling interest of the Christian religion. Have our Churches lost that seal? Are we producing reform, social or theological, faster than we are producing faith? We are not seeking first the kingdom of God and His holiness, but only carrying on with very expensive and noisy machinery a 'kingdom-of-God's industry.' We are merely running the kingdom, and running it without the Cross. We have the old trade-mark, but what does that matter in a dry and thirsty land where no water is, if the artesian well on our premises is growing dry?" (*The Cruciality of the Cross*).

Nothing but a Gospel that maintains the holiness and righteousness of God while it magnifies His mercy can prevail over the sins of the age, and this we have in the vicarious sufferings of the

Son of God. It was the Godhead of Christ that invested His sufferings with infinite value for all moral beings and made the riches of Divine grace available to sinful men. (Eph. 1:30-10; 2:7; 3:8-11). And all theories of the person or of the atonement of Christ which deny or pervert this truth do unspeakable dishonor to Him. The Bishop of London during a visit to this country well said in a speech:

"The Christian religion does not consist in a belief in a good man named Jesus Christ dying on the Cross, but consists in a belief of the sacrifice of God Himself. The future lies with no Church which sinks to what is called the new theology. What we must beware of on both sides of the Atlantic is losing the power of our message by trying to make it easier to believe."

"It is a striking illustration of the separation between the Head and the Church, that after eighteen centuries its scholars are going back to the records of His earthly life to find out who He was! If it had continued in the heavenly fellowship to which He exalted it, it would be able to tell the world with one voice both what He was and what He is."—Samuel J. Andrews, *Christianity and Anti-Christianity in their Final Conflict.*

"The whole work of Christ's redemption—His Atonement and Victory, His Exaltation and Intercession, His glory at the right hand of God—all these are only preparatory to what is the chief triumph of His grace: the renewal of the heart to be the temple of God. Through Christ God gives the Holy Spirit to glorify Him in the heart, by working there all that He has done and is doing for the soul."—Andrew Murray, *The Two Covenants,* p. 66.

CHAPTER XV

A DISPARAGED CHRIST: HIS POWER

Any view of Christian privilege that limits the possibility of grace in a believer is a serious reflection on the character and work of Christ. No sincere believer can want to sin. He strives against doing so and longs for perfect deliverance. To say therefore, as some do, that no one can keep the law of God and live without committing sin is to confess unbelief in the willingness or ability of Christ. In the former instance, his character is impeached. He is made to consent to a sinning religion because unable to prevent it; in the latter case the inefficiency of the plan of salvation is implied. He is thought of as unable to do what He *would* do in the believer's heart and life. The first supposition is disproved by the Scriptures that involve the obligation of holiness on man's part and the promise of it on God's part, as well as by those which show the Divine displeasure with sin and delight in holi-

ness. The second supposition is made impossible by the unequivocal declarations of Christ's power to save unto the uttermost them that come unto God by Him and to cause them to walk in the statutes of the Lord by His indwelling Spirit.

Moreover, the command to be holy is not an arbitrary requirement, but springs out of the very nature of God. "As He who hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all behavior. Because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy." (I Pet. 1:15-16.) What could more clearly prove that God wills the believer's sanctification? And as His commands are His enablings, the failure to realize this grace is due to unbelief.

The forgiveness of sin by Jesus Christ is received upon the authority of His word, but the transformation of character is an act of power that demonstrates the truth of His word and glorifies Him before men. "Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee,' or to say, 'Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk?' But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath authority on earth to forgive sins," (he saith to the sick of the palsy), "I say unto thee, Arise and take up thy bed and go thy way

into thine house." It is the sanctification and preservation of the soul in a world of sin that magnifies the Son of God. That complete deliverance should be effected at death, when the battle of life is over and there is nothing more to try one's faith and engage one's effort, is no such manifestation of His greatness as the power that cleanses the heart and produces a holy life in the midst of the severest besetments and trials of this world. What a convincing proof of His authority is the example of His power to "destroy the works of the devil," and to reproduce His life in mortal men! What a testimony to His pre-eminence is the experience that can record, "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily, and justly, and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you that believe!" Yet, as Andrew Murray says, "the Church believes so little in the mighty power of God and the truth of His Holy Covenant, that the grace of such heart-holiness is hardly spoken of." Said Frederick W. Robertson: "A man whose religion is chiefly a sense of pardon does not thereby rise into integrity or firmness of character. A certain tenderness of character may very easily go along with a great deal of subtlety." In

proportion as a man exhibits a strong, Christ-like character is he a walking argument for Christianity, and any teaching that prevents his faith from rising to the apprehension of such a privilege and dooms him to the existence that cries, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death," discredits the finished work and resurrection power of Christ and is far below the thought of Paul whose shout of praise betokened his experience of deliverance: "I thank God through Jesus Christ, our Lord . . . . For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus *hath made me free from the law of sin and death.* For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, *that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.*"

"The nearer we approach through critical and historical studies to the real Jesus of history, and the more closely we succeed in bringing those moral teachers who have resembled Him in any respects into broad and full comparison with the historic Christ, the more we shall find ourselves compelled to agree with those officers who had been sent to bring Jesus, and who had let Him go untouched: 'Never man spake like this man.' "—Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics.*

"Who shall deliver us from the hodge-podge of the critics, that we may listen again to the Voice on the Mount?"—Rev. Charles Wagner.

"Our blessed Saviour never speaks of the principle of the Scripture, or the idea of the Scripture, of the teaching of Scripture, of the promises of the Scripture, of this or that in the Scripture, of 'the divine element' in the Scripture, as our moderns would say, or of the Word of God contained in the Scripture. He always speaks of the Scripture, that body, that written thing, that collection of books. . . . He argues with the Jews, and quotes incidentally a passage from the Psalms. He says, in parenthesis, "And the Scripture cannot be broken." He does not say "This verse cannot be denied," or "The teaching of the Psalms cannot be gainsaid;" but simply, "Because this verse is in the Scripture, *ipso facto,* the Scripture

stands good for it, and the Scripture cannot be broken."—Adolph Saphir, *The Divine Unity of Scripture.*

CHAPTER XVI

A DISPARAGED CHRIST. HIS AUTHORITY.

I now take up the point which in a most important sense is decisive of those aspects of the subject already noticed, because it concerns the authoritative character of our Lord's teaching.

He taught that the Scriptures testified of Him, meaning the Old Testament, and urged that men should search them, with the view, as the context shows, to find Him there. The modern critic searches the Scriptures with the view, as suggested by the fundamental postulates of higher criticism, to eliminate Him. His word is not received as authoritative concerning their origin and significance. In fact, the manner in which the leading critics speak of Him is shocking to the intelligence and sensibilities of people who believe with Peter that He is "the Anointed One, the Son of the living God," and that He has "the words of eternal life." Two citations will show the limit to which these irreverent critics will go in their as-

sumption of superiority to the Son of God. In the article on the "Old Testament," in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary,* occurs this statement: "Both Christ and the Apostles or writers of the New Testament held the current Jewish notions respecting the Divine authority and revelation of the Old Testament." In his book, "The Preacher and the Modern Mind," Prof. George Jackson says: "The authorship of a particular psalm, the literary character of a book of the Old Testament, for example, are not questions that can be determined, with all reverence be it said, by the words of Jesus himself. The only authority here is the authority of facts, and if these are not decisive, nothing remains but to confess our ignorance."

Passing over the manner in which the second quotation confuses the issue by including "the literary character of a book," since Jesus did not express an opinion about that, but about the *authorship* of certain writings, what amazes one is the dogmatic manner in which it is assumed that the conclusions of higher criticism are *facts* and then putting Jesus on trial according to this assumption. A thing was not a fact because He said it, nor did He say it because it was a fact!

Such is the estimate put upon Him by these men who then talk of "reverence" and grow self-complacent over their superior scholarship. We think the language of Sir Robert Anderson a just characterization of such "reverence:"

"How inferior the Christ of these critics is to themselves, both in spiritual and natural intelligence! But the profanity of the words, and the folly and conceit which they betoken, will be plain to every Christian. What the decoy is to the libertine, these men are, though unwittingly, to the avowed infidel. Just as a pure woman is insidiously trained to hear language and to tolerate suggestions which in time prepare the way for advances of a kind that at first would have excited disgust and anger; so the holy and healthy instincts of the Christian are gradually deadened by his becoming accustomed to hear his Divine Lord thus patronized and disparaged."

And how great the contrast to such treatment was the spirit which guided one of the great expositors, the only spirit that becomes a student of the Word of God, Dean Alford, who thus closes his New Testament commentary:

"I have now only to commend to my gracious God and Father this feeble attempt to explain the most mysterious and glorious portion of His revealed Scriptures; and with it, this my labor of now eighteen years, herewith completed. I do so with humble thankfulness, but with a sense of utter weakness before the power of His Word, and inability to sound the depth even of its simplest sentence. May He spare the hand which has been put forward to touch His Ark."

Such a spirit is as foreign to the critical school as heaven is to hell. In the hands of this school the Scriptures are subjected to Philistine usage and compelled to undergo processes that reduce them to the rank of ordinary, fallible literature, void of sanctity and authority. The exalted opinion of Christ who affirmed "the Scripture cannot be broken," (not a single line or word, as this reference shows) weighs nothing in the critical estimate, since He merely inherited the traditions of His nation, and was not a scientific investigator! But it is certain that the authors of this profanation will fare no better than did their remote progenitors who laid violent hands on the Ark of the Lord. The Dagon of higher criticism

will be found broken in pieces on the floor of its temple. A tourist who visited one of the picture galleries in Florence said to the aged custodian, as he went out, "I do not think much of your pictures." "Oh," replied the old man, "that does not matter, sir; the pictures are not up for judgment, but the visitors are." We can say with equal assurance, Jesus Christ is not up for judgment, but the critics are.

Now there were during our Lord's ministry on earth the same sorts of people that exist today in relation to His word. There were the simple-hearted believers to whom the Scriptures, concealed from the common people by Pharisaical perversion and additions, were opened in all their original beauty and power by this incomparable Teacher.

The Pharisees who constituted the strongest party of opposition to His teaching, were not blamed for their belief in the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures, for Jesus builds His argument against their unbelief in Him upon this fact. Their fault was failure to appreciate the spirit of Scripture, and so overlaying it with false interpretations and narrow restrictions as to hide

the original meaning. Hence when Jesus told them that if they had believed Moses, they would have believed Him, for Moses wrote of Him, their sin was not denying that Moses was the author of certain writings, but not believing what those writings said concerning the Messiah. On the question of authorship, Jesus occupied common ground with them.

The Sadducees were the rationalists and higher critics of that day, rejecting the Scriptures as a supernatural revelation, and, of course, taking issue with the literalism of Jesus. They neither accepted the letter of Scripture, for which the Pharisees were such sticklers, nor understood its spirit. The spiritual teaching of Jesus offended them, and though they cared nothing for the orthodox party, yet because that teaching imperilled their prospects, equally with those of the Pharisees, they joined with the latter in condemning Him.

No doubt both classes talked, as modern Sadducees do, of the "shortcomings of Jesus!" And they got as little benefit from His word as these destructive critics get. Poor, weak, ignorant, mistaken Christ, who does not know

His own mind, whose "shortcomings" necessitate correction by modern as well as ancient critics! What has he to offer a world groping in darkness and oppressed by sin? A fallible teacher cannot speak with authority to the race. If he needed light himself, he can not be the light of the world. If he had "shortcomings," little hope can he bring to sinners. If he could not speak the truth concerning the Scriptures that testify of him, who can rely upon his statements concerning himself and the nature of his work? Who can accept without reservation what he says about sin, his death, his resurrection, and his coming again? In short, an incompetent teacher means an incompetent Saviour, and we are left without salvation and without hope of the future life. This is the logical result of the critical position. No wonder, therefore, that men to whom the word of Christ is not sufficient see nothing amiss in the modern attempt, in the name of science and under the euphemism of "physical research," to revive ancient necromancy and establish commerce with the dead. And this tendency will more and more prevail if the critical attitude toward the Scriptures as a final, authoritative revelation from God

becomes general throughout the Church. Yet still for all rings out the solemn warning: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," or as the Revised Version states: "Surely there is no morning for them," Isaiah 8:20. Awful disappointment! When men discount the Scriptures as a revelation and betake themselves to higher criticism or "psychical research" (described by Scripture as "seeking unto them that have familiar spirits and unto the wizards that chirp and mutter," to communicate with "the dead"), "there is no morning for them." Instead of light, there is "distress and darkness, the gloom of anguish, and thick darkness." (V. 22.) What seems light to the critic is the deceptive glare of "satan transformed into an angel of light," who has taken the place of the authoritative Christ. The supposed voice of revelation becomes a demoniacal counterfeit.

But the Christ of Criticism, thank God, is not the Christ of the New Testament. He who said, "which of you convinceth me of sin?" also said, "ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." His "shortcomings" are the vain

imaginations of Dr. Terry and other learned triflers. He is "the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God." (Rev. 3:14.) To say He did not state a fact when He attributed certain writings to Moses and Daniel is to raise the question of His veracity or knowledge, that is to say, of His competency to be what He claimed to be, the Redeemer as well as the authoritative Teacher of mankind; is to deny that He is "the Amen, the faithful and true witness."

No doctrine of the *Kenosis* which involves such a disparagement of Christ can be true. It is a contradiction of ideas to say that deity can empty itself of deity; for this would be self-annihilation. He could empty himself of that estate of glory "which He had with the Father before the world was." It was for the re-investiture of this He prayed in the language just quoted. (John 17: 5.) I think it safe to affirm that certain limitations marked the period of His humiliation, but not of the kind the critics assert. The one solitary passage adduced by them (Mark 13:32), cannot be taken in a sense that nullifies His positive affirmations. For if He disclaimed knowledge of

that one particular respecting His coming He just as positively claimed full knowledge of the fact, the manner, and accompanying events of that coming. Hence when the critics accept His word touching that one item, they are estopped from discrediting His teaching about His second coming by saying He was influenced by Jewish apocalyptical beliefs and did not speak the truth on that subject. This is to vitiate His entire teaching concerning the future life, and leave faith no standing ground. Whatever limitations He was under were *self-imposed,* as part of the emptying process. If He did not know a thing, it was because He chose not to know it; just as, if He did not do some things, which God alone can do, it was because He chose not to do them. But when He chose, He manifested the attribute of omnipotence, and when He chose, He displayed omniscience; e. g., when He knew what was in men's hearts (John 2:24-25, Mark 2:6-8). When, in answer to a question of His disciples (Acts 1:7) He repeated in different phraseology the statement of Mark 13:32, He but emphasized the subordination incident to His incarnation without implying His ignorance in matters whereof

He affirms knowledge. And the fact that He said He did not know in one instance confirms the accuracy of His statements in other instances when He makes no such denial. He would no more leave a false impression in the latter than in the former. His perfect candor and honesty were the warrant of truth in both cases. Had He been ignorant of the authorship of Old Testament writings He would not have affirmed that authorship in such positive terms.

Yet the critics, because the exigencies of a hypothesis require it, set aside His positive statements as the utterances of an ignorant man who merely adopted and confirmed the error of His time! In what sense, upon this theory, can He be regarded as an authority to the men of that or of any age? But it has been shown how preposterous as well as dishonoring to Christ is this suggestion. He never deferred to the opinions of men and more than once offended or astonished them by His independence and originality. "Never man spake like this man," they said; or, "they were astonished at His teaching, for He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." And, as Dr. A. T. Pierson has pointed

out, in reproving those who rejected His Messianic view of the Scriptures He indicated, in less than fifty words, "the whole trend of modern rationalistic criticism. It is one of the most remarkable forecasts which the Word of God contains. He said: 'For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me; for he wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?' (John 5:46-47.) And He subsequently said 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead' (Luke 16:31). Here the exact trend of rationalistic criticism was indicated nearly two thousand years ago; for it began in disputing the authenticity of Moses' writings; then it went on from that to dispute the inspiration of the prophets; then it passed on to question the authenticity and infallibility of the words of Christ and now it is disputing as to whether He even rose from the dead! Our Lord thus gave us, prophetically, the whole drift of this irreverent criticism, showing where it would begin and where it would end." (*The Bible and Spiritual Criticism.*)

It ends, as we have seen, in such a God-dishonoring estimate of Jesus as is suggested by what the critics term His "shortcomings;" by their belief that they are better able to speak with certainty and accuracy regarding the Old Testament than He of whom the Voice from the clouds said: "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him."

Accordingly we hear Him when He speaks, for example, of the writings of Moses, David, Isaiah, Daniel, and Jonah and believe what he says of them. We believe that Moses wrote what Christ attributed to him, though the critics say the writing was by some unknown who lived centuries after Moses. We believe David wrote the Psalm Jesus says he did when He quotes the passage in proof of His Godhead. We believe there was only one prophet named Isaiah and that he is the author of the part which the critics assign to an anonymous scribe, though Christ quotes from it as Isaiah's. We believe Daniel was the author of the book bearing his name because Christ affirmed his authorship. We believe the story of Jonah to be authentic because Christ sealed its historical validity by His own affirmation.

While this is not the only reason we believe these things, it is enough for our faith. We believe where the critics deny, because the Father has said, "Hear Him," and because He is infinitely more worthy of credence that His critics. At the same time we are glad to stand with all reverent scholars who find in archaeology, history, and true spiritual criticism abundant confirmation of the words of "the True and Faithful Witness," while they note the subjectivism and hostility to Divine revelation which have characterized higher criticism.

As an instance of such hostility, it may be mentioned, that the attack on the integrity of Daniel began with a repudiation of the miraculous incidents of the book. Other reasons were then sought, but they have been shown by able thinkers to be superficial and untenable. It is enough, to quote Keil, that "the testimony of our Lord fixes the seal of Divine confirmation on the external and internal evidences which prove the genuineness of the book."

The case of Jonah is, perhaps, the most striking illustration of emptying the words of Christ of all rational content chargeable to a false criticism.

Nineveh, situated upon a navigable river communicating with the Euphrates river and the Persian gulf, doubtless formed "one of the great trading stations between that important inland sea and Syria and the Mediterranean, and must have become a depot for the merchandise supplied to a great part of Asia Minor, Armenia, and Persia." (McClintock & Strong.) Phœnician ships went everywhere, carrying the produce of Assyria and Egypt, as well as their own wares and manufactures. Nothing could be more probable, therefore, than that on the very ship which carried Jonah were some Ninevite as well as Phœnician sailors, who revered the fish-god, and that they told the story of the storm at sea and of the fate of Jonah, whose subsequent ejection from the mouth of the great fish may have become known to them before his journey to Nineveh. Dr. W. M. Thompson thinks Jonah may have "carried with him, or there had preceded him, such well-authenticated proofs of his wonderful preservation in the whale's belly as deeply alarmed the Ninevites, on whose account, in an important and portentous sense, the miracle had been wrought. Nor is it difficult to discover how

such reports would have been spread abroad. The sailors of the ship could testify that they threw Jonah overboard in a tempestuous sea; very likely they saw him swallowed by the great fish. They would, therefore, be immensely amazed to find him on shore, alive and well. Such a thing would now make a prodigious noise in the world, and the news of it would fly from city to city with incredible speed. There is no reason to doubt, therefore, that the story of the prophet had preceded him to Nineveh, and prepared the way for the success of his preaching." (*The Land and the Book,* vol. i., page 100.)

There can hardly be a question that the knowledge of the mighty works of Jehovah in the history of His people Israel, ruling the forces of nature, confounding false gods, and overwhelming nations that stood opposed to His will, had spread throughout the countries to the east of Palestine. And when, under all these circumstances, the prophet as the representative of the living God, went through the city uttering his ominous prediction, alarm seized upon the king and people and produced the universal repentance described in the book. Such religious fasts were

not unknown in that empire. Figures of the fish-god have been discovered among Assyrian ruins, indicating that it must have had some kind of place in the national pantheon. Hence the report of Jonah's strange experience would lay hold upon the imagination of the Ninevites and make his preaching irresistible.

Now that these disclosures of ancient history would emphasize the sign of Jonah's appearance in Nineveh as a prophet, thus investing the sacred narrative with the suggestion of reality, has little weight with men who have a theory to maintain. The havoc which the theory plays with the language of Christ, should, however, open the eyes of many to its irreconcilability with faith in Him.

Here again the miraculous element of the book was the first point of attack. Then the book became a parable, full of good teaching, like the parables of the Gospel, and in this sense a praiseworthy production. The reference of Christ was held not to be an expression of its historical character, but simply the use of an illustration, like other parables. Unfortunately for the theory, Christ's use of the story necessitates fact and absolutely excludes the idea of fiction. Some of the

scribes and of the Pharisees asked Him for a sign. He answered: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after *a sign,* and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet, for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here."*

Observe, they asked for a sign, not an illustration merely, and Jesus said they should have a sign, namely his death and resurrection. What Jonah's experience being in the whale and coming out of it alive was to the Ninevites, Christ's burial and resurrection would be to the men of His generation. Now fiction in the former case would be utterly incongruous with fact in the latter. It may teach lessons, but can not be a sign of anything. Only *a fact* can be *a sign.*

Would not Christ be a trifler to say the Ninevites had a sign, when, according to this theory, they had nothing of the kind? Trifling, too, would have been the statement that his resurrec-

tion would be *a sign,* if He never arose from the grave. No spirit manifestation would have answered, as modern unbelief would have it. He told His disciples He was to be crucified and rise the third day. It was a *bodily crucifixion* and therefore a *bodily resurrection.* Nothing else would have convinced them. Hence His positive assurance: "Handle me and see; a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have."

The men of Nineveh were real facts; so was Jonah, as well as the other persons and events of this context. The grave of Christ was an indisputable fact; so was His rising out of the grave. This was a sign to His contemporaries. Therefore, the whale's belly and Jonah's ejection therefrom alive, which were paralleled with His own experience, must have been facts. He declared they were facts. To deny this is to impeach His authority and reduce to absurdity His statement of similiarity between these experiences.

Dr. David James Burrell, the able preacher, has exposed the infidelity of those who dispute the reality of the record concerning Jonah and the great fish in words that must elicit the hearty amen of all who believe Jesus taught the truth.

"In his reference to this narrative," he says, "our Lord did not only signify his assent to its truth, but he adventured the validity of His redemptive work upon it. As his resurrection was to be the seal of His atonement, so the truth of the Jonah narrative was a sign of His resurrection. Had He regarded it as a mere folklore, He could not have made such use of it. We do not use fables as guarantees of fact. Try it in a court of justice. 'As surely as Jason sought and found the Golden Fleece, so surely I will tell the truth.' That would scarcely answer. You must certify by an indubitable fact like this: 'As surely as there is a God in heaven I will tell the truth!' Or try it in a common matter like the contract for a debt; make out your note on this wise: 'By the sign of Jack and the Beanstalk, or of Cinderella and her Crystal Slipper, I promise to pay when this obligation falls due.' Does this seem preposterous? It is not a whit more preposterous than to allege that Jesus referred to the 'fable' of Jonah when called upon to produce a sign in verification of His own claims as the only begotten Son of God.

Is it not a remarkable fact, that the very portions of Scripture which have been most vigor-

ously assailed and held up to ridicule by destructive critics are those which Jesus marked with His authoritative seal of approval. Verily it looks as if He anticipated the things that are happening in these days! And in a clash of opinion between Jesus, as the champion of the Divine Word, and all who oppose it, there is no room for hesitation on the part of those who sincerely follow Him; they will be found standing with Him."

The case of Jonah and the fish will serve to illustrate the critical attitude toward Jesus as an authority in matters wherein His statements are contrary to modern views. If he builds an argument for His Divinity upon a Scripture which He affirmed David said by the Holy Spirit (Psalm 110:1, Mark 12:36), the critics say, "Not so; we can no longer accept the word of Jesus about such things. David never said that, and the Holy Spirit never inspired it." If the statement of Jesus is unreliable, the passage was neither inspired nor authentic, for He affirmed both. Well might He say, "Ye call me Lord, Lord, but where is mine honor?"

This derogation from His honor extends to almost every phase of His teaching. He taught

not as "one having authority," as His contemporaries claimed He did, not as one who knew His subject and spoke the truth; but as one equally ignorant with other men who have not specialized in critical studies! The trouble with such specialization is that it possesses neither the scientific nor the Christian spirit. It is as irrational as it is godless. If the specializer does not think the character of Christ entitles His utterances to be received at their face value, there is nothing in his study of *Scripture* that merits the designation of either fairness or reasonableness. Why, for illustration, pose as loyal disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the editors of certain Sunday School publications do, when their own explanations contradict His plain statements. When He healed the woman with crooked back He said Satan had bound her. No, run the notes of the Berean Quarterly; this was just the notion of the people then living. He affirmed in an eschatological discourse that a flood swept the ungodly away in the days of Noah. The critics deny His affirmation and hence nullify His application of this reference to His second coming. Such instances could be multiplied.

What will be the end of this treatment of Christ? *Anti-Christ.* The higher criticism is one of the most potent forces now preparing the Church and the world for the coming of the Man of Sin who will usurp the place of the Son of God and inaugurate a reign of lawlessness. Rejecting or neutralizing the authority of Christ by disputing the plain meaning of His words concerning the Scriptures and His own works logically and actually ends in uncertainty and unbelief in everything. And I can not do better in bringing this line of thought to a close than to quote the remarks of Handley C. G. Moule, D. D., Bishop of Durham, taken from his preface to Sir Robert Anderson's work, *The Bible and Modern Criticism.* He says:

"The attitude towards Holy Scripture of a vast deal of cultured thought and responsible teaching at present offers assuredly a problem which it is idle to dismiss as if it were not portentous. By whatever process it has come to be, teachers and disciples far and wide now regard the Old Testament (to speak of it only for the instant) from an angle totally different (I use the words deliberately) from that taken by our Lord Jesus

Christ, alike before and after His Resurrection from the dead. To Him, tempted, teaching, suffering, dying, risen, *'it is written'* was a formula of infinite import. The principle this expressed lay at the heart of His teaching. It is not too much to say that it belonged to the pulse, to the vital breath, of His message to others, and what is mysteriously yet more, to His certainty about Himself. But in wide circles of our Christendom it is now openly or tacitly taken to be out of date, to be narrow, to be uncultured, to make much of *'it is written;'* as if an appeal to a definite supernatural book-revelation were a thing discredited and to be given up.

"If a severe necessity of irrefragable truth demands this, be it so. But let not the conclusion be reached, or rested in, light-heartedly, and smoothly decorated with the comfortable phraseology current in articles and reviews. The conclusion, if true, is portentous. It is a confession that on a matter central in His message our Master was much mistaken. He appears thus as not merely capable of nescience; that is a very different matter; the most cautious, the most worshiping, theology may hold that He con-

sented, in His humanity, to limitations of His conscious knowledge and to silence outside those bounds. But here He appears as ignorant with that sort of ignorance which profoundly impairs the whole value of a teacher—the ignorance of the man who does not know where his knowledge ends, and so makes confident inferences, where his basis as to facts is unsound.

"Such a fallible Christ lies open to the suspicion of fallibility on other matters than the nature and integrity of the Old Testament; and reasonably. The theology which denies the Lord abnormal knowledge of the facts of the past is only consistent when it extends its denial to the future, and takes *cum grano* the New Testament doctrine of His return, which is a matter either of revelation, or of the vaguest and most impalpable forecast. Such extensions have undoubtedly come to be freely made within Christian circles: and not only in the *Encyclopedia Biblica.*

"If these conclusions be demanded by irrefutable fact, let them be made, and accepted. But not, I repeat, light-heartedly, and as if we were the freer for them, and could talk glibly about

them in the best modern style. Let us make them with a groan, and take care to carve no more the unauthentic promise on the tombs of our beloved.

"But first let us be absolutely sure that our detraction from the complete infallibility of the Lord Jesus Christ has infallible grounds. Let us take particular care to be sure that its basis is no *a priori* theory of the genesis of Religion, which may even already be on its way to discredit in the court of knowledge and thought."

---

*As the discussion deals only with Christ's authority in relation to the story of Jonah, there is no call for any statement of scientific fact. But since the critical objection denies the wisdom and power of God as well as the authority of Christ, it seems good to present a few facts to silence the gainsaying of foolish men.

It was the extraordinary character of the miracle recorded in the book of Jonah that set the critical mind against its authenticity. But this is a difficulty only for unbelief, whose ideas of possibility are restricted to the narrowest limits. *The essence of all unbelief is limiting God.* What with the wonderful dispensational and typical teaching of this book (teaching that would be

lost, upon the theory that the work is fiction; for types are facts before they are illustrations, and dispensations cannot rise out of parables), there was reason for such history. What with infinite wisdom and power, there was the possibility of its occurrence.

The narrative states that God "prepared a great fish to swallow Jonah." Frank Bullen, who had much experience at sea, writes of the capture of a huge sperm whale which, when dying, ejected the contents of its stomach. "The ejected food was in masses of enormous size, larger than any we had yet seen on the voyage, some of them being estimated to be the size of the hatch-house, viz., eight feet by six feet into six feet." (*Cruise of the Cachalot.*) This mass of food in its entirety was two feet longer than a tall man, and equal in breadth and thickness to the bodies of six heavy men rolled into one. (See the *New Biblical Guide* of Urquhart, vol. vii., p. 132, from which this account is taken.)

There are many kinds of whales, and every one of them, it is said, with the exception of the Greenland whale, has a gullet in proportion to its size.

Moreover, as Professor Macloskie of Princeton, has shown, the structure of the whale is such that if some air-breathing animal "should get mixed with the whale food by being shipwrecked

or by some other accident, and be carried by the influx of water between the monster's jaws, this accident must immediately rescue the intruding air-breather from death, because the intruder should find itself transferred from the water in which it was drowning into the air supply of the whale itself." The air pouch "has thick, elastic walls, and a cavity abundantly large to receive a human body, and to supply it with air for breathing." Professor Macloskie suggests that the pouch of the mother whale may serve the purpose of sheltering her offspring at times, comparably with the mother kangaroo, which uses her marsupial pouch for the protection of her young.

Nor are these the only illustrations of God's creative power to confound the reasoning of higher critics. A monster fish was caught by Captain Thompson, in June, 1912, in the vicinity of Knights Keys, Florida, which required five harpoons and one hundred and fifty bullets to subdue it, and which then lived several days. In its struggle it smashed a boat into pieces and crushed the rudder and propeller of a thirty-one ton yacht. It weighed thirty thousand pounds, was 45 feet in length, nearly 24 feet in circumference, more than 8 feet in diameter. Its mouth (open) was 31 inches, 28 inches wide, 43 inches deep. An animal weighing fifteen hundred

pounds was found in its stomach. One writer says that one of the animals taken from the monster lived seven days after its removal.

What now becomes of the claim of critics that the story of Jonah and the whale is absurd? This is no romance. Men of great repute who saw the monster have certified to the genuineness of the curiosity. The critics must be left to their own reflections.

"I trust Thee, not to the third day, not to the Easter dawn, but to the end of time.

"Thy day cometh—that sufficeth me. It is my calm in unrest, my light in the dark, my consolation in distress and defeat.

"I have been led to Thee by the flower of the fields, by the star of the skies, by the voice of the Prophets and the Gospel, by the radiance from the obscurity of the humble, as from the brow of the Heroic and the Just. But henceforth Thou hast no more need of witnesses or of fresh proofs.

"It is on Thee alone that I believe, in Thee that I would have my assurance for Life, for Death, for Eternity."—Charles Wagner, *The Better Way.*

CHAPTER XVII

THE INDISPENSABLE CHRIST.

The moral necessity of Christ to man has received no stronger affirmation than that which the experience of unbelief has sometimes wrung from the lips of thoughtful sceptics. The denial of Christianity produces a sort of mental intoxication, under the influence of which men imagine that a new era of social freedom and progress has begun. But alas! the day of disillusionment comes when, sobered by the evil effects of such denial, they view the nature and claims of Christianity with clearer judgment. They are compelled to own its divinity and power as the means of social regeneration and conservation. Christ is seen to be indispensable to the soul and its social habitation. They confess to the utter inadequacy of reason to save the individual and make society what it ought to be. Their hearts protest against the hasty conclusions of their misguided intellects. There is an aching void which the negations of unbelief only intensify.

They find at last the way of relief pointed out by the ancient Scripture—"In returning and rest shall ye be saved."

As an instance of this recovery of faith take the conversion of Professor Romanes, the scientist. How pathetic his frank confession that he was not happy in his position of unbelief, that "instead of the God of the universe, in whom he had believed as a boy, there seemed now nothing but a great big empty hole." This was almost the language of Prof. Clifford, another noted atheist, who yet was serious enough to realize the catastrophe of such an experience: "We feel that the Great Companion is dead." Prof. Romanes' conversion was simply a return to the faith of his childhood, but through the conviction that his reasoning had been fallacious. His case is proof that the fault of scepticism is reasoning from partial premises. When all the facts are lined up, reason at once declares for Christianity, and the heart utters its glad Amen.

Another example of sober inquiry and frank avowal of belief in the indispensableness of Christianity was that of the French writer and

disciple of Renan, M. Paul Bourget, who said some years ago:

"As for me this long inquiry into the moral diseases of the France of today has constrained me to recognize that for the individual as well as for society, Christianity is the absolute condition of health and recovery."

Lavredan, a French author, converted by reflections upon the present terrible struggle of his nation for existence, closes a statement concerning the loss of his unbelief with the words: "A slain people covers the fields. How hard it is to be an atheist in this national graveyard! I cannot! I cannot! I have deceived myself and you who have read my books and sung my songs!"

Professor Abelous, the physiologist, said at the Sorbonne before an audience of professors and medical students, "Science is neither moral nor immoral. They are utopian who seek to use it for ends which do not belong to it. A morality cannot be established if it leaves the religious sentiment out of consideration. As far as morality is concerned, the supreme word does not belong to science but to Christ, whose immortal words of hope and love will never pass away."

Even more fervent and personal is the testimony borne by M. Pierre Loti, in his book, "Jerusalem." Profoundly impressed by the devotion of the worshipers at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, he exclaims:

"Oh, to believe; Oh, to pray, when the end is near, as these do. For Christ, whatever men may think and whatever men may do, is the Unique. He is the One that cannot be explained. And at this moment, however strange it may appear coming from me, I would say to my friends who have followed me thus far, "Seek ye Him; try to find Him—for outside of Him there is nothing."

Listen now to the voice of one from the land that has debauched the faith of Christendom by its assaults upon the integrity of the Bible. His awakening is an illustration of the inadequacy of the new theology and higher criticism to meet the crises of life and satisfy the demands of the soul. The awful European war is doubtless a judgment upon the nations that have forsaken the God of Revelation for the Devil of rationalism, and will, it is hoped, awaken the whole Church to the nature of the obsession.

The voice is that of Pastor Haecker, of the Luther Church, Berlin, who about a year ago abandoned the liberal faction in the State Church to which he was formerly attached. A quotation from an address on his "Return to the Old Gospel," will emphasize these remarks:

"Why have I not tried 'the new gospel' longer —the gospel without the incarnate God, without the death sacrifice of God's love, without the resurrection of the Lord? Because I sought life and full satisfaction and did not find this in modern theology. As pastor, I was called not only to weddings, but to deathbeds and funerals. There I could offer no fine words on the value of the life which was vanishing, of the virtues of the dead, concerning which I was not convinced. No, at such times I needed to say that One had cried aloud over this world of graves: 'I live, and ye shall live also.' The modern man must be loved, but not with false concessions; loved as God has ever loved—with Cross-love. He must be loved with the old Gospel, which is the truth. Therefore, we must abandon half-way compromises. We must bring the message, not of great

men who are dead, but of the Son of God Who lives."

Of like comprehension were the words of the statesman, W. E. Gladstone, who wrote: "All I write, and all I think, and all I hope, is based upon the divinity of our Lord, the one central hope of our poor, wayward race."

Noble is the confession of faith by Max Müller, the eminent philologist: "In the course of a long life, in pain and sin and grief and desertion, in loneliness, in injustice and disappointments which have overtaken me, Jesus Christ has given me a strength and rest which nothing else can equal. And in all the great unknown that is in store for the future nothing can I endure or do except in His spirit, under His leading."

Incomparable Being, of whom it is written, "His name shall be called Wonderful!" Who of all the children of men that have heard that name, would not bear witness to its sweetness and power? Who that has felt the weight of the mysteries of existence and longed for the sure word of hope and comfort, but, having learned of Him, has uttered the passionate cry of Peter, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the

words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Note the testimony of that devil-priest in India, when the Spirit of God opened his understanding to the teaching of Jesus: "I saw the horror of my past and the mercy of the Christ who had redeemed me by His love. I believed what He said, that to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, a man must be born again. I knew that my sins would cling to me, in spite of my faith in the living God, unless I was converted and became as a little child. I saw, too, that it would be of little use for me to preach faith in a living God to my people, when what they needed was repentance of their sins and liberation through the love of Christ. I felt how true, how true, was this teaching of my Lord."

Blessed be His name! Our faith is not a vain thing. We know *Whom* we have believed, and therefore know what is real, and can say from the heart, with the gentle Whittier:

"No fable old, nor mythic lore,
Nor dream of bards and seers,
No dead fact stranded on the shore
Of the oblivious years;

But warm, sweet, tender, even yet
A present help is He;
And faith has still its Olivet
And love its Galilee.

The healing of His seamless dress
Is by our beds of pain;
We touch Him in life's throng and press,
And we are whole again.

Through Him the first fond prayers are said
Our lips in childhood frame,
The last low whispers of our dead
Are burdened with His name.

O Lord and Master of us all,
Whate'er our name or sign,
We own Thy sway, we hear Thy call,
We test our lives by Thine."

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 242 550 6